A Brief and Plain

DISCOVERY

OF THE

Falſeneſs and Unſcripturalneſs

OF

ANABAPTISM:

As the ſame is now Practiſed by thoſe of that Perſwaſion: Wherein are (plainly) Proved, from God's Word, the Five Particulars here Handled.

I. That God's Covenant with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7. is the Covenant of Grace, whereby all God's Elect are Saved.

II. That Circumciſion was the Initiatory Seal of that Covenant to *Abraham* and his Church-Seed, during that Diſpenſation.

III. That Water-Baptiſm is now (under the Goſpel) ſucceeded in the room thereof.

IV. That the *Gentile* Believers and their Infant-Seed, have as Real a Right to the ſame Covenant of Grace, and the Seal thereof, as had *Abraham* and his Infant-Seed.

V. That Sprinkling (or Pouring-out) Water, on the Subject of Baptiſm, is the (Undoubted) Right Way of Adminiſtring Baptiſm under the Goſpel.

By *Ja. Barry*, an Unworthy Miniſter of the Goſpel

LONDON, Printed for the Author, 1699.

LIBRARY
UNION
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
NEW YORK

TO THE

Impartial and Unprejudiced

READER,

Who desires to be Rightly Inform'd in the Nature and Design of God's Covenant with *Abraham*, (his Friend) in the behalf of Himself and all his Eccleſiaſtical (or Church) Seed, both among *Jews* and *Gentiles*; to the End of the World.

Courteous Reader,

IF *the Spirit of Grace Reigns in thy Heart, thou wilt (I doubt not) readily believe me, (eſpecially when I moſt Solemnly Profeſs, as if I were (immediately) to be call'd to the Bar of the Great Judge) that no Prejudice (or Hatred) againſt the Perſons of the People, who (without any Warrant from God's Word) Style themſelves Baptiſts, and Baptiz'd Churches of Chriſt, hath ſtirr'd me up to appear in Print, in Oppoſing thoſe Pernicious Principles, which the Men of that Perſwaſion do (with ſo much Violence and un-*

ſcriptural Zeal) Teach and Maintain. I ſincerely Bleſs God, that his good Spirit hath taught me to diſtinguiſh between Perſons, and the Errors which they hold and maintain. Their Perſons I love, and am really griev'd, that I love them no more than I do. And I hope neither they nor any others will be Angry with me for ſo doing: But their Errors (in Religion) I do from my Heart abominate and loath, becauſe hateful to God, and all good Men, who know and underſtand them ſo to be. And for thus doing, I neither fear a Frown from God, nor yet Blame from any Man, (truly-wiſe) who is able to diſtinguiſh Truth from Error.

That I ſhall be Cenſur'd and (uncharitably) Reflected on, for what I have done, in Printing this ſmall Tract, I am not Inſenſible: I am very ſure none will thus do, but ſuch as eitheir know not, or care not what they ſay.

Theſe kind of Blows I am taught to ward off with a Religious Scorn and a Holy Contempt; reſolving (in Chriſt's Strength) to purſue and hold faſt the Truth of God, let who will Bark and Cavil againſt it. It was the ſaying of Valerius Maximus, Æquo Animo ferenda ſunt, Imperitorum Convitia, & ad Honeſta vadenti, Contemnendus eſt, Iſte Contemplus. The Reproaches (*ſaith he*) of the Ignorant and Unskilful are to be born with an even (or patient) Mind: And

he

he that intends to advance towards Good and Honeſt things, muſt Contemn their Contempt. *That ſomewhat will come out in anſwer hereto, I queſtion not, (if the Men of that Principle have not loſt their old Wont) but (my Comfort and Confidence being built on the Rock of Ages) I never fear a Confutation from any (nay all) of that Perſwaſion, who Breath on the Earth, until they procure (from Heaven) another Goſpel, which is (Diametrically) oppoſit to the Goſpel delivered by the Son of God, which I am ſure will never be.*

I have made no Deviation from the good old Way chalkt out by Abraham's *God, (wherein the Prophets and Apoſtles, with all the Primitive Churches, who are gon to Heaven, walkt in) that I know of: If I have, I do faithfully promiſe, that (upon the diſcovery of my Error) I will own my ſelf therein miſtaken.*

I have been (for ſeveral Years paſt) importun'd by many Serious and Godly Chriſtians, to Print what now I expect to be Blam'd for, but never found my ſelf (thereto) inclin'd, till of late (not that I Queſtion any part of what I have Printed, being God's Truth; but (indeed) the variety of Tryals and ſharp Afflictions, which have (Inceſſantly) followed me, ſince call'd to the Sacred Office, both in my Native City (Dublin) *and alſo in* England,

have kept me back; together with my own great Aversion to appear in Print, in any Matters Controversal. But observing (of late) how strangely Anabaptism spreads both in City and Country; and being fully convinc'd, that Ignorance of (and Unacquaintedness with) the Covenant of Grace, was (and still is) that which hath given advantage to the Preachers of that Way, in drawing Proselites after them, I have (in Conscience of my Duty, both to God and Men) Improv'd my poor Talent, in Explaining and Opening up the Nature and Design of the Covenant of Grace, made with Abraham *in* Gen. 17. 7. *in hopes, that God will Bless the Plainness and Brevity therein us'd, to inform poor Ignorant (and Unthinking) Souls, how wretchedly they are imposed upon, by Preachers of that Perswasion, who have (themselves) as great need to be Instructed and Taught, what the deep Mysteries of the Covenant of Grace be, as the poor (Tongue-ty'd) Bades, whom they (in vain) Labour to exclude and shut out from the Benefits and Seal of that Covenant, in the Visible Churches of Christ. As their denying* Abraham's *Covenant, to be the Covenant of Grace, administers just ground of suspecting, whether they have any other than dark and confus'd Notions about the Doctrine of God's Free Grace, (so much spoken of in Pulpit and Print.)*

So

So their Unmercifulneſs and Hard-heartedneß to the Infants of Believing Parents, in not allowing ſuch to be accounted of the number of God's Elect, meerly becauſe of the Incapacity of ſuch, to make an open Profeſſion of Faith and Repentance themſelves, adminiſters juſt ground of ſuſpecting whether they be Orthodox in the Doctrine of Election. I am very ſure the State of Infancy can neither null or make void the Electing Decree of God, nor yet render the Elect Infant any way uncapable of that Grace of God's Covenant, to which he is Elected, or of the Seal of that Covenant of Grace in the Church Viſible; for any to hold or ſay it doth, is to Reflect on the moſt High God, and to make him a mutable Agent, like to a Fickle Man, contrary to Mal. 3. 6. Rom. 11. 29. *and (unavoidably) to ſend all Elect Infants to Hell, (who Die Infants) contrary to* Mar. 10 14. Jo. 6. 39. Rom. 11. 7. *All that I ſhall farther ſay, is only to Beg and Pray thee, for the Lord's ſake, for thy own Souls ſake, and for that Love and Tenderneß, which the Law of Nature (eſpecially that of Grace) obliges thee to have for poor Infants, (if thou be a Parent) conſider well, and weigh Judiciouſly (in the Ballance of God's Sanctuary) the Arguments laid down in this ſmall Tract, to prove what I have (therein) undertaken. If God Bleß the Reading thereof, to the keeping thee back from Eſponſing the Errors herein*

decry'd; or if it ſhould prove the occaſion of thy Vomitting up (by ſound Repentance and hearty Reformation) the love and liking thou haſt had to thoſe Principles of Darkneſs, give God the Glory of his own Grace, and ſuffer thy ſelf no longer to be impos'd on by ſuch Preachers, who are not only Intruders into the Sacred Office, but alſo Heterodox and Unſound, in what they Teach concerning God's Covenant with Abraham, *being a Covenant of Works, concerning Infants-Baptiſm, being but a Popiſh Invention, and a piece of Will-Worſhip; and what they Teach and confidently Affirm of Dipping, being the only right Mode of Baptizing Commanded by Chriſt, and Practiſed by* John *and all the firſt Baptizers: By which Principles they Raſe the very Foundation of Salvation to Grown Believers, as well as to their Infants: And diſown, that Chriſt hath any right Goſpel Churches but themſelves: From which Principles I ſhall ever ſay, and heartily pray,* Good Lord Deliver me, and all the Families of thy Faithful People.

THE

that such were Baptized. (3.) *The many Quotations of Learned Divines and Counsels, which the Anabaptists Books assured me were all of their Judgment and Perswasion herein; which much startled, and sway'd me to kind apprehensions of their way.* (4) *Their Branding Infant-Baptism with the Black Brand of Will-worship and Popery; against both which I always had (since I knew Christ in the Gospel of his Grace) and ever shall have (I humbly hope in Christ) a Mortal Dislike, and rooted Hatred. By means of the 4 particulars now mentioned, I was drawn to the very verge or brink of Anabaptism, being just on the point of renouncing my Baptism (received in my Infant State) as being a meer Nullity or no Baptism at all. My roving Spirit thus fluctuating and tossing between the Waves and Billows of doubtful and distracting Cogitations: what I had best to do in this Case? whether to offer my self to be Dipt, yea, or not? or to address my self to Ministers of the contrary Judgment for resolution (in so weighty and material a point:) Matters being thus, I providentially and happily happened into the Company of some of the Congregational Perswasion, Men no whit inferiour to those I so much admired, (for Piety) and Holiness, and who (I very well knew) were able to instruct and teach the others for matter of Learning, and deep knowledge in the Mysteries of the*

Gospel

Goſpel: Theſe debating ſundry points in Controverſy between the Anabaptiſts and the Orthodox, Proteſtant, Reformed Churches, concerning Infant-Baptiſm; I apprehended and ſaw ſo far into the Myſtery of Baptiſm, that I was at a ſtand, and began to queſtion whether I was not under a deluſion in diſliking my Infant-Baptiſm, received in Infancy; by means hereof I was ſtirred up to Pray earneſtly to God, that his good Spirit might teach and guide me in the way of Goſpel-Truth; which was ſeconded by a diligent ſearch into the Holy Scripture, and a careful reading and weighing the Arguments brought by both Parties, both for and againſt Infant-Baptiſm. And in a ſhort time (through the ſpecial aſſiſtance of the Spirit of Chriſt) I was enabled to ſee and underſtand that there was nothing of ſolid weight in the Reaſons brought againſt Infant-Baptiſm, but what are in reality repugnant, and contradictory to the Word of God: as will (I hope) in time, moſt plainly appear to your underſtanding. I have been the more prolix in ſpeaking my experience herein, that you might become ſenſible, that even Godly Men might be entangled in erronious Opinions. And to let you know what be the ordinary means to eſcape the Nets of Crafty Men, who lye in wait to enſnare poor, unſtable, (though Honeſt and well meaning) Souls. Now, as Chriſt (my Lord and Maſter) ſaid to Peter, after

his

his recovery from his fall: When thou art Converted ſtrengthen thy Brethren, *Luke* 22. *So, I am now come as my Duty binds me, to endeavour your recovery, and full ſatisfaction in theſe points, about Infant-Baptim, wherein you ſeem to ſtagger.*

Church Memb. I hope I can ſay (through ſpecial Grace) that I am no way fond of Errour: But what I do herein, I do it really from my Conſcience, according to the light thereof: I hope (Sir) you will not blame me for acting according thereto.

Miniſt. *I am far from arraigning your integrity to God, (being very ſenſible that herein you are but under a temptation, as ſtronger Chriſtians than you or I have been, and now are; neither ſhall I (in the leaſt) attempt to preſs you to act herein againſt your Conſcience: Conſcience (I am ſenſible) is a tender thing, which is to be informed, not violently impell'd or forced. I hope you have the ſame Charity for me, as to believe that what I do act in Baptizing the Infant-Seed of encovenanted Parents, and Pleading for ſuch; I do the ſame from my Conſcience, being fully perſwaded that what I do herein, is according to the Word of God: But though I do not take on me to force or Lord it over your Conſcience, I hope you will (without offence) give me leave to uſe the freedom of a Paſtor with you, in doing two things, in order to recover*

you. The first is, to reprove you for going out of the way of Duty, in exposing your Conscience to those Soul deluding entanglements, which hath occasioned your present disturbance, and unsettledness in your Principles, by deluding entanglements; I mean your going out of the way of your Calling, to stare and gaze (out of curiosity) at the plunging of Persons under the Water; which (albeit you and others may think may be done without either offence to your Brethren, or any kind of danger to your self) hath in it an infatuating, charming Energie, to allure and draw into a liking of it. Your frequent discoursing with Men of that Principle, who (you very well know) glory not a little in Proselyting People to that way: And your so much delighting to Read their Books, being not able to grapple with such subtle Enemies; the Deceipt of whose Arguments lyes covered under a false Vizzard. By these your Practises you have filled the Eyes of your Conscience so full of that dust and smoak, which is always raised by doubtful Disputations; that for want of your Monitor, (your Conscience I mean) you are now at an apparent stand in those ways of Truth wherein you ought to run swiftly; and well it were if you had been at a stand before you had so far advanced in these unscriptural Tenents: But however, seeing you are not ascended so high (in these Errors) as to be Seated in the Scorn-

ers

ers-Chair, to laugh at and deride Baby-sprinkling, as a piece of Will-worship and meer Popery; as the Anabaptists are well known to term and account Infant-Baptism: (Not for want of ignorance and prejudice, the Lord knows.) I shall now in the second place endeavour to help you out of this Quagmire, into which your own incautelousness and sinful curiosity hath (by the Art of a subtle Adversary) involved you: in order then to a speedy helping you herein, I desire you will reduce those things wherein you desire to be satisfied (about Infant-Baptism) to as few Heads, (and in as plain a method) as you possibly can; and then I shall endeavour to Answer your Objections; wherein (I faithfully promise you) I shall most freely refer my self to the Word of God, and to the Writings of those Divines now in Glory: At whose Writings the Wisest of Anabaptists are glad to light their Candle, though in the point of Baptism they are accounted neither able nor worthy to teach them. And when you and I are come to Conclusion, You in Objecting, and I in Answering, it will then appear whether Infant-Baptism be any part of Will-worship or meer Popery, as it is represented by its Adversarys.

Church Memb. Sir! I like your Proposal very well, and in complyance with your reasonable Request, as also in order to my own satisfaction, I shall reduce those particulars

culars wherein I desire to be satisfied, to 3 General Heads; under each of which I hope you will give me liberty to Propose (by way of Objection,) what I think convenient and fit to start.

Minist. *I like very well to hear you name but 3 General Heads; I hope you will observe Order and Method in what you intend to Object under those 3 Heads.*

Church Memb. I will observe Order and Method as well as I can; and shall (I hope) with becoming Candor, weigh in the Ballance of an impartial and unprejudicate consideration and judgment, what strength appears to be in your Answer; and in case I find my Conscience satisfied by the strength of your Answer, I shall readily own it, and give Glory to God.

Minist. *I desire you to name the 3 General Heads, for fear we should forget them when we come to be earnest in our Dispute.*

Church Memb. The 3 General Heads which I propose to be satisfied in, are as follows, (1.) The Covenant which God made with *Abraham*, mentioned in *Gen.* 17. 7. (2.) The Seal of that Covenant. And (3.) The Subjects who have a visible Right to that Covenant and the Seal thereof. Under these 3 Heads (I suppose) may be brought in all that I need to say.

Minist.

Miniſt. *As touching your firſt General Head,* (viz.) *The Covenant which God made with* Abraham, *What would you be at, about it.*

Church Memb. I would pray you to clear it up from the Word of God, that that Covenant is a Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works; for the apprehenſion I always had (till of late) that that Covenant was the Covenant of Grace, was the foundation whereon my former Principle, (*viz.*) Infant-Baptiſm was founded; but being informed and taught otherwiſe, both by Mens Preaching, and alſo by their Books. I am much in doubt as touching the lawfulneſs of Infant-Baptiſm.

Miniſt *I perceive then you apprehend that Infant-Baptiſm is like to ſtand or fall, as the Covenant of God with* Abraham, *is proved to be either a Covenant of Grace or otherwiſe; what if it be made good from the Word of God, that the Covenant of God with* Abraham *is a Covenant of meer Grace.*

Church Memb. Truly, to be plain and ingenious, I cannot ſee how Infant-Baptiſm can ſtand, if that Covenant be a Covenant of Works; as I am ſenſible the Baptiſts hold and teach it is; and which I am inclined (under my preſent light) to judge it muſt be as they ſay. But in caſe it be proved otherwiſe, I plainly ſee the Anabaptiſts

tists are like to suffer a miserable Shipwrack; for their holding and teaching that Gods Covenant with *Abraham* is a Covenant of Works, is the principal Pillar, on which almost all their Arguments against Infant-Baptism lean. If that Pillar then be shaken and overthrown by Scriptural Arguments, the whole structure will tumble of course.

Minist. *I am very glad that You and I do (in any measure) agree in our Sentiments about this matter; To let you see then, how Sandy a foundation the Anabaptists Build on, I shall bgin to lay down some Scriptural Arguments, to prove them most heterodox and unsound in this point of* Abraham's *Covenant; wherein they do most evidently rase the very foundation of Life and Salvation to* Abraham *himself, and all his Seed.*

CHPA·

CHAP. I.

Of God's Covenant with Abraham, *wherein is plainly proved, that that Covenant, in* Gen. 17. 7. *is the Covenant of Grace.*

THat God's Covenant with *Abraham*, in *Gen.* 17. 7. was, and ſtill is, the Covenant of Grace, diſpenſed in a Church way: None of the Orthodox ever did, (or do) deny, that I can find, That the taking that Covenant in this Senſe, is the Foundation Principle, on which all ſound Proteſtants, do maintain and juſtifie, the Right of Believers Infants to Baptiſm, is beyond contradiction.

When the Moſt High, and Soveraigne Lord God ſaw fit to make known his Will and Pleaſure, to be; that his Covenant of Grace, (agreed on, between himſelf, and his Son Chriſt in Eternity) ſhould be Diſpenſed in an Eccleſiaſtical (or Church) way, he ſingles out (above all other men) *Abraham* his Friend; on whom he Confers the Honourable Title, of the *Father of the Faithful*, Rom. 4. 11. Not that *Abraham* did, or could (poſſibly) Beget a Believer (as ſuch) or could convey into the Children he Begat (according to Fleſhly Generation)

nation) that Noble Grace of Faith, wherewith God's Free-Gift had Bleſſed himſelf. But God opens and propounds his Everlaſting Covenant of Grace and Salvation to him, as a Publick Perſon, who was to Perſonate all true Believers; who (in after Ages) were to be Members of his Viſible Churches, to the ſecond coming of Chriſt.

The Sum and Subſtance of that Covenant, is briefly comprehended in the Words of *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will Eſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed after thee; in their Generations, for an Everlaſting Covenant; to be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee.*

This Covenant hath *Two* Eſſential Parts, as all Right Covenants have, (1.) God's part, held forth in the Words, *I will be a God to thee, &c.*

The meaning whereof (according to the Analogie of Faith,) muſt be thus underſtood. Tho' thou *Abraham*, whom I now call, to become my Friend and Favoright, and a Publick Head (or Repreſentative) of all believing Church Members, to the end of the World; be'ſt an undon and guilty ſinner, polluted in thy Nature, and born under *Adam*'s Covenant of Works; liable and obnoxious to its Curſe, and to the Wrath to come; unable to recover or help thy ſelf out of that deplorable Condition,

THE INTRODUCTION.

An occaſional Diſcourſe between a Miniſter and a Church Member, concerning Infant-Baptiſm; wherein ſundry material Queſtions are put by the Church Member; and plainly and particularly Anſwered by the Miniſter, for the Information of the Ignorant, and the ſatisfaction of ſuch as are ſtaggering in their judgments, about the lawfulneſs of Infants-Baptiſm.

Miniſter. *Brother* Edward, *By what I have heard from ſome of my Neighbours, as alſo by the diſcourſe which paſt between you and me when laſt together, I ſuſpect that ſome have been tampering with you, to draw you away to Anabaptiſm; is it ſo or no? deal plainly, to the end I might addreſs my ſelf to my duty, in giving you ſatisfaction herein, from Gods Word.*

Church Member. I muſt ingeniouſly acknowledge Sir, that I am not without wavering, and doubtful thoughts in my Mind about Infant-Baptiſm, occaſioned partly, by diſcourſing with ſome of that way and perſwaſion; partly, by reading ſome Books which were put into my hand; which, to

ſeems full of clearneſs, that Infant-Baptiſm is no way warrantable or juſtifiable by the Goſpel of Chriſt.

Miniſt. *I find then that I am not miſtaken in my apprehenſion of you in this matter: but for your encouragement, I muſt tell you, that you are but tryed herein by a temptation; for which I think never the worſe of your Souls ſtate, neither are my hopes and confidence of your integrity towards God, a jot or whit leſſened by the inclination in your Mind to favour that Opinion; for I have known ſome very Holy and upright Hearted Chriſtians, who in the ſimplicity of their Hearts have ſtrongly enclined to favour and eſpouſe that cauſe and principle, as the moſt plauſible and likely to agree with the Goſpel, there being no mention at all of Infant-Baptiſm in the Goſpel, neither in Precept, nor yet in Example, to recommend it; yea, I my ſelf have (in my firſt ſetting out in the ways of Chriſtianity) met with temptations to draw me to that Opinion; and that by the very ſame means which hath occaſioned your ſtaggering herein. And the main things which induced me to hanker after that Principle, were, (1.) The high and charitable opinion I had of ſome of that Party, being Men of high attainments in Grace and Goſpel Holineſs. (2.) There appearing to me no command for Infant-Baptiſm in all the Goſpel, nor yet any one inſtance where it is ſaid*

that

dition, into which thy natural Birth (as *Adam*'s Child) hath put thee. And albeit, thou be no way worthy of any Favour, yet I think fit, to let thee know, what thoughts and purpoſes of Mercy and Kindneſs, I have in ſtore for thee, *Abraham*: And for the Reſt of mine Elect, whom I have Choſen to my ſelf in Chriſt, (the Promiſed Meſſiah,) of whom, that Son which I have Promiſed thee, is to be a Type: And in whoſe Perſon, all mine Elect, are to be Allegorically (or Typically) Repreſented; and that, as thy Son is to be a Type of mine, in whom I have Elected and Choſen them.

I frankly and freely Pardon and Forgive thee, all thoſe Tranſgreſſions and Sins, wherewith, (as *Adam*'s Child) thou ſtandeſt Chargeable, for breaking that Covenant of Works I made with *Adam*, thy (and all Mankinds) Natural and Fæderal Head.

I Account thee perfectly Juſt and Righteous in my ſight; not by, or for, that Principal of Inherent Holineſs, which the Spirit of Grace (in effectual Calling) hath wrought in thee, (which Inherent Holineſs is (ever) the fruit and effect of a Juſtified State; but never the Procuring (or Meriting) Cauſe. But I account and eſteem thee, as Juſt and Righteous, as if thou

thou hadst (in thy own Person) exactly performed that Legal Righteousness, which the Law Moral requires; on the alone account of my Sons righteousness, which (as the Mediator, and surety of this my Covenant of Grace; he is to perform in the behalf of thee, and all mine Elect) I most freely impute to thee.

I Sanctifie, and Renew, thy vitiated, and poluted Nature, by my Sanctifying Spirit, that thou maiest be capable of Communion and Fellowship, with me, both here, in my Church Militant: And here after, in my Church Triumphant.

I Adopt thee to be my Son, by Grace, and by virtue hereof, thou art restored to all the Blessings, Rights and Priviledges, which *Adam* (thy Natural and Federal Head) lost and forfeited, by his Apostacy and Defection: Hereby thou art Admitted (as a Free Denizon) into the Family and Houshold of God: from whence thou wast cast out (in *Adam*) when he was ejected and cast out, for his Rebellion, witness his expulsion out of Earthly Paradice, a lively Type of the Heavenly. I Promise to Establish thee in Grace, so as thou shalt never (more) be in danger, of loosing thy self, or forfeiting my Love and Favour any more: For ever I will be a Sun, and a Shield, to furnish and supply thee with all necessary

Ac-

Accomodations for Life in this World; I will Protect and Defend thee, from all adverse Powers, Spiritually and Bodily, which shall contrive and seek thy Ruin. And (finally) I will receive thee into Heaven, when (by Death) thou goest hence; where thou shalt Live and Reign, with me, Eternally.

And the very same Mercy and Favour, which I have (now) expressed, and shewn to thee; I do oblige my self, by the promise of this my Covenant, that I will do to all mine Elect, who are to spring from thy Loyns. As also, to all mine Elect, who are to come of the Gentile Race; to the end of the World.

(2.) Man's Part; As for thee (*Abraham*) this thou must do, (on thy part) thou must walk Humbly and Uprightly before me; thou must make the Moral Law (Engraven by the Finger of my Spirit) on the heart of *Adam* (thy Natural and Federal Head) the standing Rule of thy Obedience, both Negatively and Positively. In all the parts of thy Obedience, thou must look (exactly) to three things, (1.) To the Subject Matter of thy Obedience, let it be what I Command and Require, not what Creatures Devise or Enjoyn. (2.) To the manner, See that thou do it in Faith, keeping thine Eye on Christ (my Son)

Son) for Acceptance, and Acting all by Strength derived from him. (3.) To the end, See that my Glory be that thou aimeſt at, and deſigneſt, in all thou goeſt about. Thou ſhalt not do my Work and Service in a Mercenary way, as a Servant that Works for Wages; but thou muſt obey my Command as a Son, with freedom of Spirit, and from a Principle of Love and Gratitude, knowing and conſidering, that my Grace and Love hath made Proviſion of all that is needful, to make thee (every way Eternally happy, both here and hereafter. The dreadful Curſe, and Eternal Death, to which (by Sin) thou becameſt obnoxious: My Son Chriſt (Typ'd out by the Ram) hath ſet thee for ever Free from it. And that by his being made a Curſe, and undergoing Death for thee, (as being thy Sponſor or Surety) at his Hands I have Received the full of that Debt, whereto thou becameſt liable, by breaking my Law, there remains not the leaſt Mite for thee to pay; ſo that (now) thou haſt no cauſe to fear my Vindicative Juſtice; the many and ſharp Afflictions, wherewith thou ſhalt meet, in thy way to Glory, ſhall be but the gentle Chaſtiſements, of thy (dearly) Loving, and Reconciled Father; who (by them) will Purge out, the remains of thy indwelling Corrup-

ruption: and ſweetly wean thee from the enticing Objects of the vain and bewitching World thou Liveſt in. That Perfect and Spotleſs Righteouſneſs, which muſt Recommend thee to me, and preſent thee Blameleſs, before the Throne of my Glorious Holineſs, in the Third Heaven, is (Subjectively) Inherent, in the Perſon of God-Man, thy Mediator and Surety; to this Mediatorial Righteouſneſs of his, thou ſhalt add nothing, neither thy own Perſonal qualifications; nor yet, the Holineſs of Saints or Angels; (as if thereby) thou couldeſt be made more Acceptable, than that Righteouſneſs of his doth make thee. Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant, both thou and all thy Eccleſiaſtical, (or Church) Seed, throughout your Generations, till my Son comes to Judge the World at the laſt day. Thou, and all thy Church Seed, (which Springs from thee by Fleſhly Generation,) ſhall obſerve to have all your Males mark'd with Circumciſion, the viſible Token and Seal of this my Gracious Covenant, which I have (now) entred into, with thee; for thy ſelf (a ſtipulating Father,) and for all thy Children; who are to be the Members of my Sons Mediatorial Kingdom; or Viſible Church on the Earth.

And when Chriſt my Son ſhall come in the Fleſh, and ſhall enter upon his Mediatorial

Kingdom, whatever visible Token or Seal he shal appoint to Succed in the Room of Circumcision, thy Gentile Church Seed (as well as Jews,) who are to believe in him, shall (carefully) observe to be Sealed therewith, both they and their Infants: And that by Virtue of this my Covenant, I now make with thee, for thy self and them. And to the end, that neither thou, nor thy Children (in succeeding Ages) may Be Ignorant of what my Will and Pleasure is, concerning the Non-Elect, who are to come and spring from Believing and Holy Parents, in my visible Church or Churches. I notifie to thee, and thy Church Seed after thee, (throughout their Generations)t hat my Soveraign Will and Pleasure is, that all the Infants of my Believing, Professing Church Membrs, shall be markt with the Visible Token or Seal, of this my Covenant in the Church, whereof the Professing Parent (or Parents) are Members, and that without any regard had to the Elect, or Non-Elect. For, seeing that the Secrets of my Decrees and Counsels are known to my self alone, I Will, that thou, and thy Church Seed after thee, (to the end of the World) do, in the Judgment of (rational) Charity, Judge all the Seed, and Infant Posterity of my Professing People, who have laid hold on my Covenant, (by an Eternal Visible

Pro-

Profeſſion) to belong to the Election, and to own them for ſuch, untill they (by open Apoſtacy, and final Impenitency) do manifeſt the contrary. For albeit my Viſible Churches do conſiſt of Elect, and Non Elect, and the one as well as the other do partake of the Seal of my Covenant, and are partakers of all Church Priviledges; yet none ſhall ever partake (internally and ſavingly) of the inward Grace and Mercy Signified, and Sealed by the Token and Seal of my Covenant, (in the Church Viſible,) but the Elect only, whoſe Names are (particularly) Regiſtred in the Lamb's Book of Life. And altho' the Non-Elect in my Church, do fall ſhort of the ſaving Benefits of my Covenant of Grace; yet ſhall they find that I am no way behind with them; for, altho' I (the Abſolute Soveraign of the World) be no way obliged to the Creature (eſpecially fallen Rebels,) yet, ſeeing it is my Pleaſure to Employ the Non-Elect in the Service of my Church, (while it is in a Militant State) that thoſe common Gifts (of my Spirit) wherewith they are to be endowed, might be laid out and improved, for the good and wellfare of my Elect and Choſen; I will give them a Place in my Church, that they ſhall be called by my Name, and ſhall have an equal Right (with mine Elect) to the Seal of my Covenant,

and all outward helps and means of Salvation, in the Church Visible; whereby it shall plainly appear (in the day of Judgment) that their missing Heaven, and falling short of Eternal Life, was of their own Procurement. Notwithstanding, As is the Service wherein they are Employ'd in my Church, I will give them a plentiful Recompence (*viz.*) a Temperal Reward, in Lieu of a Temporal Service; Such as Bodily Health, Worldly Wealth, Pleasures and Honours, *&c.* which are (every way) more suitable to their Spirit, and are more sought and delighted in (by them) than are the things laid up for my Chosen: Plain Instances (hereof) I have seen fit to leave on Record, in the Persons of *Ishmael* and *Isaac*, both born of *Abraham* (according to the Flesh) the one a Reprobate the other Elect; both must be of the Church Visible, and Sealed with the Visible Token and Seal of Gods Covenant with *Abraham*. Of the same Nature is that of *Esau* and *Jacob*, both born of *Isaac* (according to Fleshly Generation) yet the one a Reprobate and the other Elect; both must be of the Visible Church, and Sealed with the Seal of the Covenant, and pass (currant) for Church Members, (before men) untill they (themselves) make the contrary to appear: As did *Ishmael*, *Esau*, &c. And

And thus, having as plainly and as briefly as I could, (for the information of thoſe who are yet Ignorant of *Abrahams* Covenant) Explained and ſhewn the Subſtance and Tenure of Gods Covenant with *Abraham*, for himſelf and all his Eccleſiaſtical, or Church Seed, both Jews and Gentiles, to the end of the World.

I come now to lay down ſome Scriptural Arguments, to Prove, that Gods Covenant with *Abraham*, (as now Explained) is the Covenant of Grace; which God Propounded to *Abraham*, in *Gen.* 17. 7. And not a Covenant of Works, as the Anabaptiſts Teach it is.

That it is the Covenant of Grace, and no other, will evidently appear to any, who look not aſquint on the Arguments following.

Arg. 1. The firſt Argument is this, If God never yet made a Covenant of Works, with any (meer) Man, but that which he made with ſinleſs *Adam* (the Natural and Federal Head of all Mankind) in the State of Innocency, before the Fall: Then God's Covenant with *Abraham*, is the Covn ant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works. But God never (yet) made a Covenant of Works, with any meer Man, but that which he made with ſinleſs *Adam*, (the Natural and Federal Head of all Mankind) in the State of Innocency, before

the Fall: Therefore, Gods Covenant with *Abraham*, in *Gen.* 17. 7. is the Covenant of Grace, and no other. Plain it is, and none (without Lying againſt God) can deny it, that God made a Covenant of Works with *Adam*, and in him with all Mankind.

The Condition whereof was, do and Live; ſin and Dye. And as plain it is, that *Adam* Fell, by Tranſgreſſing that Covenant, by which Fall he loſt the Bleſſed Image of God to himſelf, and all his Poſterity, whereby he and his Poſterity became (utterly uncapable of Life and Salvation by that Covenant.

Now, *Abraham* being (by natural Birth) a Son of the firſt *Adam*, and (as ſuch) born under the Curſe of *Adam*'s Covenant, and partaker of a ſinful and polluted Nature; which rendred him as uncapable of performing any Work, which (as a condition) can Anſwer the Laws demand; as a man naturally dead, is uncapable of raiſing or quickening himſelf; or as a Sparrow is uncapable to remove, or carry on its Back, the greateſt Mountain in the World. To what end ſhould the only Wiſe God make a Covenant of Works, with ſuch a fallen ſinner.

Arg. 2. If to hold and Teach, that God's Covenant with *Abraham*, (in *Gen.* 17.

17. 7.) is a Covenant of Works, and not a Covenant of Grace, be a high Reflection on God; and alſo deſtructive to the Souls of Men; then is God's Covenant with *Abraham* (in *Gen.* 17. 7.) the Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works. But to hold and Teach, that God's Covenant with *Abraham*, (in *Gen.* 17. 7.) is a Covenant of Works, and not a Covenant of Grace, is a High Reflection on God; and deſtructive to the Souls of Men.

Therefore, God's Covenant with *Abraham*, (*Gen.* 17. 7.) is the Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works.

For rendring this Argument Unanſwerable, Two things want confirmation. Firſt, That to hold and Teach, that God's Covenant with *Abraham* is a Covenant of Works, is a high Reflection on God. And Secondly, That the ſame is Deſtructive to the Soules of Men.

The Firſt of theſe will evidently appear, to the unprejudic'd and Impartial Reader, if he (ſeriouſly) conſider, how Inconſiſtent it is, with the Divine Attributes of God, to make a Covenant of Works, with a Lapſed, Polluted Sinner, whom he knows to be (altogether) Dead in Treſpaſſes and Sins, and (every way) as unable to will, or do, any Work that is

(Spiritually) good, as a Dead Man is able to quicken and raise himself.

For Illustration sake, let it be considered, How unbecoming a Wise and Prudent Man it would be, to strike a Covenant (or Bargain) for ten, or twenty thousand Pounds, with an Insolvent Person, who is well known not to be worth ten Farthings in the World; and (which is yet worse) who hath neither Wit to contrive, nor Health or Limbs to Work to get a Penny towards paying such a vast Sum. I cannot so much as doubt of any (worldly Wise) Mans unwillingness to be guilty of such an oversight as this: And shall the (Unerringly) Wise God, be guilty of so great an Absurdity?

Secondly, As this Principle Reflects on God; so it is Destructive to the Souls of Men. This appears (beyond all contradiction,) in that it raseth the very Foundation of Men's Salvation: by denying that Covenant to be a Covenant of Grace, which *Abraham* and *Isaac*, with *Jacob*, and all the *Old-Testament* Believers depended on for Eternal Salvation; and by which, we (Gentile Believers) hope to go to Heaven. For, most plain it is, that by this pernicious Principle, *Abraham* is lost, with all who died trusting to the Grace exhibited in that Covenant. And if *Abraham* (the Father of the Faithful) be,

trust-

trusting to a Covenant of Works; I cannot see, how any of his Eccelsiastical Church Seed can be Saved, any more than he is. For, by a Covenant of Works, no meer Man, ever was, or shall be justified and Saved.

Arg. 3 If the Scripture no where, (either directly or by consequence) calls God's Covenant with *Abraham*, (*Gen.* 17. 7.) a Covenant of Works; then it is a Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works. But the Scripture no where (either directly or by consequence,) calls God's Covenant with *Abraham*, a Covenant of Works: Therefore the Covenant of God with *Abraham*, is the Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works.

If it cannot be Demonstrated from the written Word, or by Arguments Deducible therefrom, that *Abraham*'s Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. is called, (or can be proved) a Covenant of Works; They who so hold and Teach, will be found ranked among those who call good evil; and evil, good; and who put *Light for Darkness, and Darkness for Light*, *Esa.* 5. 10. For Men to take on them, to term *Abraham*'s Covenant a Covenant of Works, without any Warrant Divine, is (to me) an Argument of an ignorant, rash and presumptuous Spirit: from which Charge, let such Men

ſee how they can Acquit and free themſelves.

*Arg.*4. If *Abraham* was Juſtified by Faith, and not by Works; then the Covenant which God made with him, is the Covenant of Grace, and not of Works. But *Abraham* was Juſtified by Faith, and not by Works; Therefore the Covenant which God made with him, is the Covenant of Grace, and not the Covenant of Works. That *Abraham* was Juſtified by Faith, and not by works, the Scripture is expreſs, and clear, *Rom.* 4. 2, 3, 4. *Gal.* 2. 5, 6, 7.

Arg. 5. If God hath made no other Covenant of Grace with *Abraham*, diſtinct from that in *Gen.* 17. 7. then, that Covenant in *Gen.* 17. 7. is the Covenant of Grace: but God made no Covenant of Grace, with *Abraham*, diſtinct from that in *Gen.* 17. 7. Therefore, that Covenant in *Gen.* 17. 7. is the Covenant of Grace, and not the Covenant of Works.

That which will determin the Point in Controverſie, is this, let thoſe who (herein) oppoſe me, lay down a Scriptural definition of the Covenant of Grace; and that in ſuch Terms, as beſt pleaſe themſelves; and in Caſe, their own definition, do not agree (at leaſt for Subſtance) with *Gen.* 17. 7. if it be according to God's Word, then am I freely willing

willing to own my ſelf (herein) miſtaken: If they refuſe to comply with ſo fair a Propoſal, let the Judicious and Impartial Reader Judge, who is at the Loſs (herein,) they or I?

I conclude this Chapter with this *Dilemma*, (viz.) *Abraham*, (the Father of the Faithful) he is either Sav'd, or elſe he is Damn'd; one of theſe two the Adverſaries (I now oppoſe) muſt grant, for there is no middle State for Souls Departed.

If they ſay he is Damn'd, then is there no ground left us to hope, that any of *Adam*'s Poſterity ever were or ſhall be Sav'd; for we have no other Covenant whereby to expect Salvation, but that of *Abraham*: And if he Periſhed under that Covenant, ſo muſt we.

If they grant, that *Abraham* is in a State of Salvation, (as they muſt, if they ſpeak by the Spirit of Chriſt) then *Abraham* was Juſtified and Saved by a Covenant of Grace, and if by a Covenant of Grace, then that Covenant mention'd in *Gen.* 17. 7. muſt needs be the Covenant of Grace; for beſides that Covenant the Scriptures know no other.

Againſt what I have ſaid, (and all Orthodox Proteſtants conſtantly hold and affirm) concerning *Abraham*'s Covenant being a Covenant of pure and abſolute Grace, this is Objected by the Adverſaries.

Obj. ct.

Object. *The Land of* Canaan *was a Temporal Bleſſing, therefore ſuch was the Covenant, of which Circumciſion was a Temporary Seal.*

I Anſwer in two Particulars. Firſt, The Promiſe of the Land of *Canaan* is no Eſſential part of the Covenant of *Abraham.* Let the Words in the 7th Verſe be *Read without prejudice.* The laſt Clauſe of the Verſe doth fully comprehend the ſum and ſubſtance of the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham.* The Promiſe of the Land of *Canaan* is only by way of Addition or Overplus. No Eſſential part of the Covenant it ſelf. The Covenant is briefly comprehended in theſe Words; *I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee:* For in theſe Words God Engages himſelf (by free and abſolute Promiſe) to *Abraham* and to his Elect Church-Seed, that he will be a God to him and them, to do all things for them, which are needful to compleat their Happineſs, both here and hereafter.

Secondly, The Land of *Canaan* was promiſed, not as it was any Eſſential part of the Covenant of Grace; or, as if real Bleſſedneſs conſiſted in the actual Enjoyment thereof: But as the ſame was a Temporary Type of Heaven. And for want of underſtanding and conſidering this very thing, many, who have thought themſelves

Wiſer

Wiſer (in the Myſteries of the Goſpel) than their Neighbours, have prov'd themſelves ſhort of true Wiſdom; in this Particular at leaſt.

To convince of this Miſtake, let that of our Saviour (in *Mat.* 6. 33. *But ſeek ye firſt the kingdom of God, and the righteouſneſs there of, and all theſe things ſhall be added to you*) be weighed in the Ballance of an unprejudiced Conſideration; and to an Impartial Eye, that looks not Aſquint at theſe two places of Holy Scripture, *Gen.* 17. 7. and *Mat.* 6. 33. it will moſt plainly appear, that Temporal Bleſſings are held forth in one, as well as in the other. And if it muſt needs be granted, that becauſe God made the Promiſe of the Land of *Canaan* to *Abraham*, &c. that therefore God's Covenant with him and his, was a Covenant of Works: It will (as neceſſarily follow, that Believers to whom Chriſt directs his Speech in *Mat.* 6. 33. are now under a Covenant of Works, as well as *Abraham* was. And ſo, neither *Abraham* (the Father of the Faithful) nor any of his Seed, (the Elect I mean) either of the *Jewiſh* or *Gentile* Race, are like to be Saved or Enjoy God for their Portion. And by this way of Arguing, it will evidently appear to any ſeeing Man, (who ſhuts not his Eyes for fear of being convinced) that while the Adverſaries (I now

Oppoſe

Oppoſe in this Controverſy) were employed in deviſing this Shift to prove God's Covenant (with *Abraham*) to be a Covenant of Works; and that (on purpoſe) to exclude poor Infants from that Covenant, and from Baptiſm (the now Seal thereof,) they have (inſenſibly) ſhut both *Abraham* and themſelves too, out from being Saved: And what advantage will (hereby) accrew to their Cauſe, let it be improved to the utmoſt.

Object. 2. *It is again Objected, If the Covenant in* Gen. 17. 7. *be a Covenant of pure Grace, and not a Covenant of Works, and that all* Abraham's *Children be alike Intereſted therein, then doth Grace come by natural Generation, contrary both to Scripture and Reaſon.*

Anſw. The ground of the Objectors miſtake, Lyes in two things: Firſt, His not diſtinguiſhing or conſidering, that the Children of Believing *Abraham*, are ſaid to be in Covenant two Ways, or in a twofold Reſpect: Firſt, Internally, by Virtue of God's Election: And thus none are (or ever ſhall be) in Covenant, but *Abraham*'s Seed, (*viz.*) The Elect, who are in Scripture (by way of diſtinction) ſtyled, the Children of Promiſe, Typ'd out in the Perſon of *Iſaac*, *Gal.* 4 28.

Theſe (and they alone) Partake in the ſaving benefits of the Covenant; and have

alſo a right to the viſible Sign or Seal of the Covenant in the viſible Churches of Chriſt, under the Goſpel Diſpenſation.

Secondly, Externally, by Virtue of the External Profeſſion made in the Church: And thus the Non-Elect (as well as the Elect) are ſaid to be in Covenant with God, in his Churches Viſible, (here on Earth.) Theſe Albeit, they never partake in the ſaving Bleſſings of the Covenant; yet by Virtue of the External Profeſſion made, they and their Infant-Seed, (though not Elect,) have an External Right (in the Church Viſible) to the Token (or Seal) of *Abraham*'s Covenant; and to all other Priviledges and Ordinances in the Church, whereof they are capable, according to the Revealed Will of God: By Virtue hereof it is, that God calls ſuch his People; and he will have his Church to call and own them for ſuch too, until they manifeſt themſelves to be otherwiſe; and that by a voluntary Defection, and final Apoſtacy. Plain Inſtances hereof are (Graphically) ſet down in God's Word, in the Perſons of *Iſhmael* and *Eſau* (in whoſe Perſons the Reprobate Seed of *Abraham* were (Allegorically) typ'd out as the Elect Seed) were Allegorically and Typically repreſented in the Perſons of *Iſaac* and *Jacob*: The former of theſe Sprang from the Fleſh of *Abraham*, as well as the latter:

latter: And on this account, they had a place in the VisibleChurch, and were marked with the Seal of God's Covenant, as well as the latter. They were esteemed and reckoned as God's Children, and true Members of the Church, until (by Defection and Apostacy) they discovered themselves to be otherwise. If this Distinction be not allowed, I cannot see how God can be (orderly) Worship't by any Visible Church on Earth.

This is the Summ and Substance of God's Covenant, made with *Abraham* in *Gen.* 17. 7. and with his Elect Seed, *&c.* And by Virtue of this Promise, *Abraham* and (with him) all his Elect Seed would have been most Happy and eternally Blest, had no Promise been made of the Land of *Canaan.* So (in like manner) shall all true Believers (with their Elect Seed, be eternally Happy and Blest, being made Partakers of the Righteousness of Christ, (intended in *Mat.* 6. 33.) Albeit such Believers (and their Elect Seed) should (with *Lazarus*) Die on a Dunghil, for want of those Temporal Blessings held forth by Christ, in the abovementioned Promise, which plainly demonstrates, that the Promise which God made to *Abraham*, of giving to him and to his Seed, the Land of *Canaan*, was no more an Essential part of the Covenant made with

with him and his Seed, than the Promise held forth by Christ, in the place (above-named) proves, that Believers and their Elect Seed are (now) under a Covenant of Works. All the difference which I can find between these two places, is, that the Promise in *Gen.* 17. 7. was Typical of the Kingdom of Heaven: The other is not so. Were this Covenant of God made with *Abraham*, (the Father of the Faithful) as he was a Stipulating and a Covenanting Representative (in a Church Visible,) but rightly understood and believ'd with Application to Mens own Souls, I am perswaded there would be neither Anabaptists nor Arminian in the World.

The Church of *Rome* Holds and Teaches that Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion: I am not ashamed to say, it is the Mother of all Errors in Religion. Neither am I afraid to affirm it to be both the Mother and Nurse of Anabaptism and Arminianism.

CHAP. II.

Proving that Circumcision was a Seal of Gods Covenant of Grace, made with Abraham, *and his Seed.*

Arg. 1. EIther Circumcision was the external Token (or Seal) of *Abraham's*

ham's Covenant (of Grace) mentioned, *G.* 17. Or elſe that Covenant had no Seal at all

The Adverſary cannot avoid here, He muſt either Grant or Deny; if he grant that Circumciſion was the Seal of *Abrahams* Covenant, I have what I was to prove; if he deny it to be the Seal of that Covenant, then it lyes at his Door to demonſtrate what was the Seal of that Covenant: If he ſay that that Covenant had no Seal at all, He will (thereby) not only gainſay the Word of God, but alſo ſpeak againſt reaſon; for all Men know it is an eſſential property of a Covenant to have a Seal, to confirm the matter contained in the Covenant.

Arg. (2.) If Circumciſion is (by God himſelf) called the Seal of the Covenant, then is it (beyond all Controverſy) the Seal of the Covenant.

But Circumciſion is (by God himſelf) called the Seal of the Covenant.

Therefore Circumciſion is (beyond all controverſy) the Seal of the Covenant. For Proof of the Argument, compare *Acts* 7, 8, with *Gen.* 17, 10. To which I will only add, *Rom.* 4, 11, which will put the matter (in Diſpute) beyond the reach of all Diſpute. The Words are plain and expreſs, in calling Circumciſion the Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith; which plainly proves two things. Firſt, That Circumciſion

ciſion is a Seal of the Covenant made with *Abraham*. Secondly, That the Covenant of which Circumciſion was the Seal, was the Covenant of Grace, and no other.

CHAP. III.

That Water-Baptiſm ſucceeded, or came in the room of Circumciſion, (under the Goſpel Diſpenſation) I prove by 3 convincing Arguments.

Arg. 1. IF there be no other Initiatory Seal appointed by Chriſt under the Goſpel but Water-Baptiſm, then is Water-Baptiſm come (or ſucceeded) in the room of Circumciſion, to be the initiating Seal under the Goſpel: But there is no other initiatory Seal appointed by Chriſt under the Goſpel, but Water-Baptiſm.

Therefore Water-Baptiſm is come or ſucceeded in the room of Circumciſion, to be the initiatory Seal under the Goſpel.

The truth and ſtrength of this Argument will the more clearly appear, by duly conſidering that Circumciſion was (under the dark Diſpenſation of the Law) the initiating Seal of the Covenant, which will not, (cannot) be denyed, unleſs by Men who underſtand (or care) not what they ſay: That Water-Baptiſm is, (and muſt be) ſo now;

now; muſt (of neceſſity) be acknowledged by all who own that the Lords Supper ſucceeded, or came in the room of the Paſſeover.

I humbly conceive no Wiſe Man will oppoſe me, in ſaying that the Churches of the New-Teſtament have as great need of an initiating Seal of the Covenant of Grace, as had the Church of the Jews under the Old: And if Baptiſm be not that Seal, I know not what is; for that Circumciſion is (now) abrogated and aboliſhed under the Goſpel, none can deny; and that ſome other viſible ſign muſt ſucceed (or come) in its room, muſt be granted by them who acknowledge that the Lords Supper ſucceeded (or came) in the room of the Paſſeover.

Arg. (2.) If the Adverſaries themſelves do (practically) own Baptiſm to be the initiating Seal of the Goſpel Covenant, then Baptiſm is the initiating Seal of the Goſpel Covenant: But the Adverſaries themſelves do (practically) own Baptiſm to be the initiating Seal of the Goſpel Covenant. Therefore Baptiſm is the initiating Seal of the Goſpel Covenant.

Thoſe I (here) diſpute againſt, before they can overthrow this Argument, muſt abandon their own practice in making Baptiſm by Dipping, the Door of Entrance into their Churches; by which Practice they Unchurch

Unchurch all other Churches who are not of their own Perſwaſion .It is well known in *London*, and elſe where, where Anabaptiſm is practiſed, that they make Baptiſm (by Dipping) the form of a right Goſpel Church; on which account it is they refuſe Communion (in the Lords Supper) with the moſt Sanctified Believers, if they are not Dipt after their Mode.

'Tis true that ſome of that Perſwaſion would ſeem more moderate and charitable than others (of that way) while they make Saintſhip the (only) term of Church Communion: Theſe ſeem not to lay ſuch ſtreſs on Baptiſm as the reſt of that Perſwaſion do; they will admit to the Lords Supper (with them) thoſe of other Perſwaſions, though not Baptized in their way; but how ſuch will be able to juſtify their practice in admitting Unbaptized Perſons to the Lords Supper, I cannot underſtand; to me it is plain, that there is the ſame parity of reaſon for keeping back an Unbaptized Perſon from the Lords Table, as there was for keeping back an Uncircumciſed Perſon from the Paſſover of Old. The firſt of theſe (*viz.*) Baptiſm is the viſible Badge of our Union (with Chriſt) in Regeneration, (as Circumciſion was to the Believing Jews) The other, (*viz.*) the Lords Supper, is the viſible Badge of our Communion and Fellowſhip with Chriſt,

Chriſt, as the Paſſover (of Old) was to the Believing Circumciſed Jews: Now, as Communion is a fruit of Union, and follows after it, ſo no Perſon ought to be admitted to the ſecond, that is, not (actually) a viſible Partaker of the firſt. It is not to be doubted, that theſe who (in Charity) invite us to the Lords Table (with them) do account us as Unbaptized Perſons, while they reckon our Baptiſm (received in Infancy, and by Sprinkling) but a meer nullity, that is, no Baptiſm at all.

Arg. 3. If Water Baptiſm have the ſame end and uſe aſſigned it by God, as Circumciſion had of old, (*viz.*) to ſignifie and Seal to Believers and their Infants Elect, the truth of their Regeneration, *&c* Then Water Baptiſm hath Succeeded in the room of Circumciſion. But Water Baptiſm hath the ſame end and uſe Aſſign'd it by God, as Circumciſion had of old, (*viz.*) to ſignifie, and Seal to Believers (and their Elect Infants,) the truth of their Regeneration, *&c.* Therefore, Water Baptiſm hath Succeeded, in the room of Circumciſion.

This Argument depends on the Right and Genuine Explication, of that Text, in *Coloſ.* 2. 11. *In whom alſo ye are Circumciſed, with the Circumciſion made without Hands; in puting off the Body of the ſins of the*

the Fleſh, by the Circumciſion of Chriſt, Buried with him in Baptiſm, wherein alſo, you are Riſen with him, through the Faith of the Operation of God, who hath raiſed him from the Dead.

I ſhall not here meddle with Explaining this, becauſe, I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak to it when I come to Anſwer the Objections brought againſt Baptiſm being come in the room of Circumciſion: whereto I refer my Reader.

Againſt what hath been ſaid, concerning Circumciſion being the Seal of the Covenant of Grace, *&c.* it is Objected, thus,

Object. *Circumciſion was only a Seal of a Temporal, Carnal Covenant, Sealing only Earthly and Temporal Bleſſings, to the Carnal Church of the Jews.*

Anſ. To this Objection, I Anſwer in three Particulars.

1. I have already proved, that God's Covenant with *Abraham*, of which Circumciſion was the Seal) was (and ſtill is) the Covenant of Grace, and not a Covenant of Works; as ſome Ignorant and Injudicious Teachers would fain have it to be: And that (meerly) on the account of keeping Poor Infants from Baptiſm, which they know could never be Juſtified, (by God's Word) ſhould they Judiciouſly acknowledge, that *Abraham*'s Covenant

is

is the Covenant of Grace; and that Circumciſion, was the Seal thereof: and that Water Baptiſm, is (now) come in the room thereof.

2. In that ſome have reflected on that Covenant, calling it a carnal Covenant of Works, and the Church which was to Obſerve and Practice Circumciſion (the Seal thereof) a carnal Church: all I need to ſay (by way of Reply) is, to bewail the carnallity of their Uncircumciſed Hearts and Lips; who have no better or higher Apprehenſions of God's Holy Covenant, (the Grace whereof muſt bring them to Heaven if ever they come thither,) and of his ſo highly Honoured Friends, *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, with all the reſt of the Holy Patriarchs, Prophets and Godly Believers of that Day; than to call it a carnal Covenant, and them a carnal Church.

3. If *Abraham*'s Covenant, was a Covenant of Works, to him and his Children, then it muſt (needs) be ſo to us Gentile Believers, and to our Children now.

And if ſo, let the Adverſary Demonſtrate (if he can) how *Abraham*, or any of that carnal Church (as they falſely term it) can be ſuppoſed, to be (now) in a Saved State: Or, what ground of hope, we Gentile Believers (and our Children) have,

have, that we or any of ours ſhall go to Heaven when we Die, ſeeing that we are ſtill under the very ſame Covenant with *Abraham*; which Covenant, if i tbe a Covenant of Works, and not of Grace, no Salvation, can be expected; and if the Believers (under that dark Diſpenſation) were Carnal, and not Spiritual, how comes the unerring Wiſdom of God to Propound them to Believers under the Goſpel, for Examples and Patterns of Faith, Patience, *&c. Heb.* 11. *Heb.* 12. 1. *Ja.* 5. 10. Let it be farther conſidered, that, Albeit, the Seal of Circumciſion Sealed no ſaving Bleſſings to the Non-Elect; it doth not hence follow, that it Sealed no other than Temporal Bleſſings to the Elect, ſeeing, that (to them) the Heavenly were (Typically) included in the Earthly.

As touching the Earthly Bleſſings, which Circumciſion Sealed to the Non-Elect, they were greater and better than God was (any way) obliged to give them. I am ſure than they (ſavingly) improved.

Object. *We utterly deny, that Water-Baptiſm did ſucceed and come in the room of Circumciſion.*

Anſw. For confirmation of the Affirmative, let the three Arguments already laid down under this Head be ſeriouſly (and without prejudice) conſidered: To which

I will only add the Explication of *Coloſ.* 2. 11, 12. whereon I have grounded a fourth Argument, to prove, that Water-Baptiſm ſucceeded and came in the room of Circumciſion. In the place above quoted, the Apoſtle plainly ſets forth to the believing *Coloſſians* (and in them to all believing *Gentiles*, to the Worlds end) two things, (neceſſary to be known and believed by all true Believers.)

Firſt, That they, who (by a true lively Faith) have Embrac'd the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, (as held forth in the Goſpel,) evidencing their Faith by the Truth of Goſpel-Sanctification. They (and none elſe) who are Adult, are made actual Partakers of the true and ſaving Circumciſion, effected in the Soul by the Spirit of Chriſt. And which was (Externally) ſignified by the outward Circumciſion.

Theſe Believers having (now) obtained the Spiritual Circumciſion, are not at all to be Concerned or Troubled, that they are not outwardly Circumciſed with the Circumciſion made with Man's Hands. Foraſmuch as that which was (Externally) Signified and Sealed to the believing *Jews*, by the outward Circumciſion, is (now Internally and Powerfully) wrought in their Hearts by the Spirit of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

Secondly,

Secondly, The Apoſtle ſets forth in this place, that Water-Baptiſm is Inſtituted and Appointed by Chriſt (under the Goſpel Diſpenſation) to be (to believing *Gentiles*) the ſame that Circumciſion was to the *Jews*, (*viz.*) A Viſible Sign and Seal of *Abraham*'s Covenant to all his Eccleſiaſtical Church-Seed among the *Gentiles*, (*viz.*) All of that Race, who (on God's calling them) Believe in and Obey the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. To theſe and their Infant-Seed (and none elſe among the *Gentiles*) Baptiſm doth (now under the Goſpel) Signify and Seal the very ſame Spiritual Bleſſings and Church-Priviledges, which Circumciſion (of old) did Signify and Seal to the believing *Jews* and their Infant-Seed.

This I take to be the Senſe and Meaning of the Apoſtle, in that ſo much controverted place. In this Senſe, I hope, I ſhall Die ſatisfied. And herein (I humbly conceive) none of the Orthodox will differ from me, which Senſe being granted, it is beyond the reach of all Scriptural contradiction, that Water-Baptiſm was Inſtituted and Appointed (by Chriſt) on purpoſe to ſucceed in the room of Circumciſion.

CHAP. IV.

Shewing and proving, that the Infants of Believing Gentiles (*now under the Goſpel*) *have as real a Right to the Covenant of Grace, and to Baptiſm, the* (*now*) *Viſible Sign and Seal thereof; as had the Children of* Abraham (*according to the Fleſh*) *to it, and to Circumciſion, the then Seal of the Covenant of Grace.*

And, that they are as capable of the Grace and outward Seal of the Covenant, as are the moſt Adult grown Believers.

I ſhall lay down Four Arguments, to evince and make good (*againſt all Oppoſition*) *what I now aſſert.*

Arg. 1. THE firſt Argument is thus fram'd: If God (himſelf) did, by abſolute Soveraign Grace, comprehend *Abraham*'s Church-Seed in the Covenant of Grace he made with believing *Abraham*, (their Stipulating and Covenanting Father) and never ſince Repeal'd that Gracious Act of his: Then the Infants of *Abraham*'s Church-Seed are ſtill Intereſted in the Covenant of Grace, and have as great Right to, and are as capable of the Grace and Seal of that Covenant as ever.

But God (himſelf) did by abſolute Soveraign Grace, comprehend *Abraham*'s Church-

Church-Seed in the Covenant of Grace he made with believing *Abraham*, (their Stipulating and Covenanting Father) which Gracious Act of his was never ſince Repealed.

Therefore the Infants of *Abraham*'s Church-Seed are ſtill Intereſſed in the Covenant of Grace, and have as great a Right to, and are as capable of the Grace and Seal of that Covenant as ever.

I cannot ſee how this Argument can (poſſibly) be overthrown, but by proving, that God did alter and change that Covenant he made with *Abraham* (his Friend,) for himſelf and for his Church-Seed: The which, when the Adverſary doth by Evidence of Scripture, (not abuſed and perverted,) I ſhall then yield the Cauſe, and bewail my Miſtake. But two things cauſe in me an unſhaken Confidence, that this can never be done. *Firſt*, The Immutability and Unchangableneſs of God, on which very account he is ſtyled a Covenant-keeping God, who never yet caſt off any poor Sinner, until that Sinner did firſt actually caſt God off; the which (I think) the Adverſary dares not deny. *Secondly*, The Impoſſibility of poor Infants actually caſting God off, and that becauſe of their Incapacity in reſpect of Age.

Arg. 2. If Infants be at all Saved, they are Saved by the Grace of God's Covenant made with *Abraham*; which Covenant, and the External Seal thereof, (in the Viſible Church) muſt belong to them alſo.

But Infants are Saved by the Grace of God's Covenant, (made with *Abraham*) and in no other way.

Therefore the Covenant of God's Grace (by which they are Saved) and the Seal thereof, (in the Viſible Church) muſt belong to them alſo.

This Argument hath been conſtantly maintained (by the Orthodox) againſt the Enemies of Infant-Baptiſm, with ſuch ſucceſs, that I never yet heard the Man's Name, who was able to anſwer or overthrow the ſame by ſound or ſolid Argument.

To deny Salvation to Infants is a Principle ſo monſtrouſly Cruel and Uncharitable, (expoſing to the Judgment of God, and to the deſerved Frowns of all Tender-hearted Parents) that ſome, who account it a point of great Skill and Wiſdom, (in the Myſtery of the Goſpel) to Decry and Witneſs againſt Infant-Baptiſm, have declared themſelves ſtrongly inclin'd to believe, that all Infants are Saved, and that without diſtinguiſhing between Elect and Reprobate, or between the Seed of Profeſſing

feſſing Godly Believers, and that of Mahometans, *&c.* a Principle (altogether) as ſilly and groundleſs as that of denying the Right of Believers Infant-Seed to the Covenant of Grace, and the Viſible Token or Seal thereof in the Church. And at what Door this (Heterodox) Dream ſhould enter, or from what Root or Principle it ſhould ſpring, I know not, unleſs from that Popiſh Arminian Principle of general Redemption and univerſal Grace. Here, by the Conceſſion (or Grant) of the very Adverſaries, Infants are Saved; but how, or in what way? whether by a Covenant or without a Covenant. Here they are (profoundly) ſilent, not daring to mention any Covenant at all, fearing an Advantage may be (thereby) given, to diſcover or prove the Right of Infants to the Covenant. It is ſufficient (ſuch Dreamers Judge) to leave poor Infants to the general Mercy and Grace of God, as thoſe do, who Dream and Conceit, that the very Damned in Hell ſhall (at length) be delivered from the Torments of that Place. For which Chymerical Whym, there is as much to be ſaid (from the Word of God.) As there is to prove, that God will extend the Grace of his Covenant to all Infants Dying ſo.

The Adverſary (I diſpute againſt) knows (very well,) that ſhould it be granted (*in Terminis*) in plain Terms, that Infants are Saved by the Grace of the Covenant, it can no way be avoided, but that Infants muſt be in that Covenant, and muſt have an Indiſputable Right (*in foro Eccleſiæ*) to the outward Seal thereof.

But this muſt be deny'd, and its contrary aſſerted, (for the moſt Glorious Goſpel-Truth,) (*viz.*) That Believers only (excluding their Infants) are Intereſted in the Covenant, and have a Right to the Seal thereof; and that in the Right of the Profeſſion they make before Men.

Now, how abſurd and contrary to the very Tenure and Deſign of God's Covenant with Chriſt (in the behalf of the Elect) this Principle of Anabaptiſm is? I leave to every Unprejudiced Reader (who underſtands any thing in Religion) to Judge. And whether to reſtrain the Promiſe of God's Covenant (which equally extends to all the Elect) to that part of the Elect, which are Adult and Grown up, to make a Profeſſion, and to extend the Grace of God beyond the bounds of his own Covenant, be not equally to Raſe the Foundation of Goſpel-Truth, and to Uſurp the Throne of God (or to Invade his Prerogative) in the Church; I leave to Wiſe Men to determine.

If

If thus to do falls not under that dreadful Commination (or Woe threatned) in *Rev.* 22. 18 I am greatly miſtaken.

Arg. 3. If Infants do ſtand in as real need of the Grace of God's Covenant as the Adult do, and be (every way) as capable thereof as the Adult are, then muſt they (of neceſſity) be allow'd the Seal thereof in the Church.

But Infants do ſtand in as real need of the Grace of God's Covenant, and are (every way) as capable thereof as the Adult are.

Therefore the Seal of God's Covenant in the Church muſt (of neceſſity) be allow'd them.

That Infants are Partakers of *Adam*'s Guilt, and alſo of that Pravity and Pollution of Nature, which came by *Adam*'s Fall, I am confident will be deny'd by none (unleſs by downright Dreamers) now to own this.

And at the ſame time to Teach and Hold, that Infants are (becauſe not Grown up to the uſe of Reaſon and actual Faith) uncapable of Regeneration, is to deny Salvation to all Infants, who Die Infants: And how well this Principle accords with all Infants being Saved, (who Die Infants) is not difficult to underſtand. If this be not *Contradictio in Terminis*, (*viz.*) A Contradiction in plain Terms, I know not what a Contradiction means.

The Lord Chriſt (who can neither lye nor be deceived in what he ſaith) aſſures us, that *except one be Born again, he cannot (poſſibly) ſee the Kingdom of God.* *Jo.* 3. 3. wherein the abſolute need of Regeneration is diſcovered and aſſerted; and the Subject of which, this is predicated (in that Text) being indefinitely and univerſally expreſt; we are taught that neither Adult nor Infant, ſhall ever enter Heaven, till that work of Regeneration paſs on the guilty polluted Soul: And to ſay that an Adult (or grown) Perſon (by reaſon of his Age) is capable of this great Change, but that an Infant (becauſe he wants the uſe of reaſon, *&c.*) is uncapable of it. What is this but (interpretatively) to hold and ſay that the Creatures own will and reaſon muſt concurr to the producing the New Creature in a Dead Soul.

And how advantageous this Principle is to *Papiſts*, *Arminians*, *Pelagians* and *Socinians*; the Learned and Orthodox well know.

The Enemies themſelves do (with us) acknowledge that Water-Baptiſm is a Paſſive Ordinance; and ſtrange it is, that thoſe (of that Party) who are concerned to deck and adorn the Frontiſpiece of their Books (againſt Infant-Baptiſm) with ſuch Ornate Floriſhes of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin

Latin Sentences, do not (in their way of arguing about this matter)give us to underſtand that they underſtand and know the meaning and proper ſignification of the word Paſſive, better than it appears they do; certain it is, and the Learned know it) that the term Paſſive ſignifies and imports a Non-agency in the Subject, when a change ispaſſing on it, or a work producing in it; to the effecting of which change (or work) the Subject Recipient neither wills nor acts any thing towards the production of ſuch a change.

If I underſtand any thing of Gods Mind (revealed in the Sacred Scripture) or was ever (experimentally) acquainted with the Spirits method in paſſing that great change on a Sinner, in effectual Calling. The work conſiſts of two parts. Firſt, Gods Gracious Acts, in freely Pardoning all the Rebels Sins and Tranſgreſſions committed againſt the Law,imputing to him that ſpotleſs Righteouſneſs of Chriſt his Son (the Sinners Sponſor or Surety) as truly and really as if that ſpotleſs Righteouſneſs had been acted and performed by the Sinner himſelf (Perſonally.) This is the firſt part wherein that great change lyes or conſiſts, which (in Divinity) is called Juſtification.

The Second is, Gods quickening and renewing the inward Powers and Faculties of

the

the Soul; by communicating a principle of Spiritual Life to the Sinner, in every of the Souls faculties within: I do not mean (or intend) that in this work of Regenerating the Sinner, the Natural faculties (concreated with the Nature of *Adam*) are deſtroyed or annihilated, but that the Predominancy of thoſe vitious qualities (inhering in the Souls faculties) is overpowered by the Sanctification of the Spirit; and a contrary Principle of ſaving (and unlooſable) Grace is communicated to every of theſe faculties in the Soul, whereby the new Principle communicated, maintains its own Being in thoſe reſpective Faculties, (and this through the continual ſupply of the Spirit which produced the change) and making continual reſiſtance againſt that Vice and Corruption (as yet) remaining in the ſame Faculties where the new Creature is appointed to War and Combat, until that Sinleſs Perfection (promiſed in the Covenant of Grace) ſuperſede and diſpoſſeſs that indwelling Corruption (in the Soul) under which the new Creature continues to groan, until a perfect releaſe come.

This is called Sanctification; and when the ſet time (prefixt in Gods Decree) for calling an Elect Sinner, is come; what produceth this great change?

I

I will ſuppoſe the Sinner to be come to the Years of Manhood, capable of acting or exerciſing his natural Faculties; doth his will or his reaſon help the Almighty in producing ſo miraculous a change? can the Eye of this Sinners blind reaſon(and underſtanding) ſee into or comprehend the hidden Myſtery of that Wiſdom manifeſted and ſet forth in that ſtupendious and aſtoniſhing contrivance of Gods juſtifying and reconciling to himſelf an Apoſtate, Rebel, Sinner, by the imputed Righteouſneſs of another? can the Eye of blind reaſon be capable of this? can the Will of this dead Sinner incline or move it ſelf towards the Sinners own Converſion, to be a Coadjutor or Fellow-helper, to forward or help the Almighty in effecting this ſtrange and miraculous change? can it (poſſibly) be that Spiritual (or Corporal) Blindneſs can cure it ſelf, or that Enmity and Rebellion can change its own Nature?

Let the experience of every (rightly) aſſured Believer ſpeak to this.

If then nothing in the poor dead Sinner, neither the uſe of his natural reaſon, nor yet any activity in his unrenewed Will doth contribute any help to produce ſo wonderful a change; the work muſt needs be (entirely) Gods own work. From which I argue in the behalf of poor Infants, if God

can, and doth freely pardon and blot out the Millions of actual Sins (added to the original guilt) of an adult Sinner; if he can and doth freely and moſt graciouſly impute the Righteouſneſs of his Son; and by thus doing, juſtifies an adult Sinner: If God can (and doth) by the irreſiſtable efficacy of his own Holy Spirit, renew the faculties of the Soul of an adult Sinner, which is (as I may ſay) ſteeped (and even ſoaked) in Vitioſity and actual Pollution; cannot the ſame Almighty, Juſt, Wiſe and Gracious God do and effect the like change in and upon a poor helpleſs Infant, though that Infant underſtand not what is done to it, neither is capable of contributing any help towards ſo great a change?

From what hath been (here) offered to conſideration, to me it is evident and plain, that when Men cry out and ſay, Infants, (while Infants) are uncapable of Regeneration, becauſe they want the uſe of reaſon, *&c.* they ſpeak moſt injurioufly and ignorantly againſt God himſelf, as if he could not (or would not) effect that in and for an Elect Infant which he doth for an adult Sinner; as the juſtifying and renewing an adult Sinner hath no dependence on the reaſon, will or ſpeech of a grown Sinner, even ſo the want of actual reaſon, activity of Will or Speech in an Infant, cannot (poſ-

ſibly)

ſibly) hinder God from effecting this great and gracious work in and upon an Elect Infant, though the poor Infant can do nothing towards ſo great a change. The Subject Recipient of this work of Regeneration, is (every way) Paſſive, the adult as well as the Infant.

Agreeable to this Act of Gods in changing a Sinner, is that Ordinance of Water-Baptiſm, whoſe principal uſe is twofold. Firſt, to ſignifie and repreſent his own gracious dealing with the Sinner (Baptized) in Pardoning all his Sins, for Chriſts ſake; whoſe Blood repreſented by the Water in Baptiſm) was ſhed for the Remiſſion of the Sins of all, comprehended in that Covenant of Grace, whereof Baptiſm is a Seal. And Secondly, that it may be a Seal to confirm to the Baptized (if Elect) all the gracious Promiſes of the ſame Covenant of Grace; as Gods work (upon the Soul of a true Convert) is (in reſpect of the Sinner) wholly Paſſive, ſo Baptiſm (the outward Sign and Seal of Gods Covenant of Grace) is altogether Paſſive: And as the Wiſdom of Chriſt ſaw fit to appoint the Element of material Water to be uſed in Baptiſm, as (above all the other Elements) moſt ſuited to the deſign of that Ordinance, becauſe of the Analogie and reſemblance which is between Water and the Blood of Chriſt; ſo no

mode

mode or way of adminiſtring this Water-Baptiſm doth ſo exactly and to the life, ſet forth the freeneſs of Gods Grace and Mercy (exhibited) in the Covenant of Grace, then the act of Sprinkling or pouring out the Water on the Party Baptized. By this way of Sprinkling (under the Goſpel) there is a ſweet and orderly Harmony kept between the Pen-men of Gods Word, both under the Old and New-Teſtament Diſpenſation, with whom, whoever ſtudys to agree (in applying the Water of Holy Baptiſm) they will be (at length) found to be in the right; how many and black Cenſures ſoever are heapt on them by injudicious Spirits: The Spirit of God (in the work of Regeneration) applys the Spiritual Baptiſm by Sprinkling or pouring out of his Graces on the Soul. There muſt be an Analogie kept between the thing ſignified and the outward Sign.

Againſt what hath been laid down to prove Infants right to Baptiſm, (the Seal of Gods Covenant) many things are objected. I will (for brevity ſake) contract the Objections (with my Anſwers) to as few particulars as (poſſibly) I can.

Object. 1. *In the Words of the Grand Commiſſion, there is not one word concerning Infants.* Mat. 28. 19. Go ye and Teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name, *&c.*

This

This ſeems too weak, (though well meaning) Minds to be unanſwerable: But in the ſtrength of him who gave out this Grand Commiſſion, I hope to ſhew how wretchedly the Objector is miſtaken herein.

In order whereto, let two things be ſeriouſly (and warily) conſidered.

Firſt, that albeit Chriſt the Lord doth not mention Infants (in particular) yet he includes them in the Words of the general Commiſſion: *Go Teach all Nations, Baptizing them*, &c. Here the Lord commands (expreſly) that all ſuch as belong to Gods Covenant (with *Abraham*) *Gen.* 7. 7. ſhall be Baptized; Namely, all who ſhall embrace the Son of God by Faith, and their Infant-Seed (if any they have) That this is the true ſenſe and meaning of Chriſt in that place, is clear to any who do not (wilfully) ſhut their Eyes; for evident it is, and none can deny that he (there) commands to Baptize all Nations, not excepting againſt or forbidding the Diſciples to Baptize little Infants: He knew that he ſpake to Men, who (after the ſending of the Holy Ghoſt) ſhould know and conſider that *Abrahams* Covenant (with Believers and their Infant-Seed) was to remain and continue the ſame to the end of the World. And this, (together with the ſharp rebuke he gave to his Apoſtles, for offering to hinder Little Ones being

being brought to him; and his laying before them such a convincing reason wherefore such should not be kept from coming to him. *Mar.* 10. 14. was the principal, (if not the only reason) wherefore his infinite Wisdom saw it not needful to mention Infants in particular, they being (most certainly) included in the general term all Nations: All Men (who know any thing of Learning) understand that *Omne majus continet in se minus*, (every greater includes (or contains in it the lesser) is a sure and standing Rule both in Logick and Divinity.

Agreeing with this sense (I have given off the Grand Commission) is that of *Peter*, *Acts* 2. 39. *For the Promise is to you and to your Children*, &c. which affords an invincible Argument to prove that there is (now under the Gospel) no change of *Abrahams* Covenant, (any other than in the external administration of it) The Covenant (in its substance) abides the same for ever: By the Grace thereof all Gods Elect (both of the Jewish and Gentile Race) are to be Saved. *Rom.* 3. 29. What I have said will yet receive farther confirmation by what is laid down by *Paul* in *Gal.* 3. 14. *That the Blessing of* Abraham *might come upon the Gentiles, through Jesus Christ*, &c. The places now quoted out of *Acts* 2. 39. and *Gal.* 3. 14. presuppose a command to all, whether

(whether Jew or Gentile) who (by Faith) receives Jesus Christ for a Saviour) that they shall be Signed with the Seal of *Abrahams* Covenant, according to *Gen.* 17. 9. For if the Gentiles (who believe in *Abrahams* Saviour) do expect that they and their Infants should be made actual Partakers of the Blessings of *Abrahams* Covenant; they must be sure to observe and keep Gods Covenant with *Abraham* throughout their Generations.

Secondly, seeing that Christ (himself) words the Commission so in general terms, (which (undoubtedly) includes the particular) not excepting against Infants: It must (necessarily) follow, that if Infants be a part of those Nations which the Apostles, *&c.* are commanded to Baptize; that Christ commands them to Baptize Infants as well as any others. Reader, observe the Words of the Commission, *Go and Teach all Nations*, &c. Here is no more mention of grown Persons, Men or Women, than there is of Infants. If then Anabaptists cannot deny that Infants are a part of Nations, and that they can no way prove how *Abrahams* Blessing can come on the Gentiles (through Christ Jesus) any other way than by and through the Covenant of *Abraham*. It will (unavoidably) follow, (all the Wit in Man cannot oppose it

it with ſucceſs) that Infants as well as adult Perſons are (as the proper Subjects of Baptiſm) intended (by Chriſt) in the Grand Commiſſion.

Object. 2. *None are the proper Subjects of Baptiſm, but ſuch as are firſt taught* Go and Teach, *&c. Infants are not capable of Mans Teaching, therefore they are not the proper Subjects of Baptiſm.*

Anſw. This, with the Objection already ſpoken to, ſeems (to weak and injudicious People) to be unanſwerable, (for excluding Infants from Baptiſm) but he that looks into it with a Spiritual Eye, will find nothing in it againſt Infants.

In order to diſcover the weakneſs and miſtake of the Objector, let it be obſerved (with care) that the Word Teach, is twice mentioned in the Words of the Commiſſion; *Go and Teach all Nations, Baptizing them;* &c. And in Ver. 20, *Teaching them to obſerve*, &c.

The firſt Teach is (in the Original) *Matheteuſate*; and the other is *Didaskontes*; which I chooſe to ſet down in the *Engliſh* (rather than in the *Greek*) Character, to the end the Unlearned may Read them; and (in Reading) obſerve the great difference which is between the two Words, and that both in the Letters and Sound of the Words; if this be taken notice of, it

will

will afford to the Unlearned (who would not be impos'd upon) ground to ſuſpect, not only the Skill (in Tongues,) but alſo the Honeſty and Faithfulneſs of thoſe Guides, whom they Judge come nearer to Infalibility in what they Teach, than do the other eminent Servants of Chriſt, who differ from them; and at whoſe Labours the ableſt Preachers of that Party, are glad to Light their Candles.

As theſe two Words differ in Letters and Sound, as the Unlearned themſelves will find, (if they be but Faithful to themſelves,) ſo they differ alſo in their Senſe and Signification, as the Orthodox and Learned well know. I begin with the firſt, (*viz.*) *Matheteuſate*, which ſignifies (properly) to Diſciple, or to make Diſciples in all Nations, where the Goſpel ſhall be (gladly) received.

How is this to be done? *Anſw.* Even as God Taught *Abraham*, when he Inſtructed him in the great Myſtery of the Covenant: The which, when *Abraham* Embrac'd for himſelf and his Infant-Seed, he received (gladly) the Viſible Token or Seal of that Covenant of Grace, (*viz.*) Circumciſion, and marks out his Infant-Seed, by putting the ſame Seal of the Covenant on them, and that in compliance with God's Command.

It

It is but Rational to ſuppoſe and grant, that the firſt Subjects of an Ordinance ſhould be Perſons Adult, and Grown up to the uſe of Reaſon, that they may be capable of Acting for not only themſelves, but for their Off ſpring and Poſterity alſo, who are not (while Infants) capable of Acting for themſelves.

This was God's Way and Method with *Abraham* (his Friend) he Propounds his Covenant of Grace to him and (in him) to his Seed, as their Stipulating and Covenanting Head and Repreſentative. In Inſtructing *Abraham*, God (in *Abraham*'s Perſon) Inſtructs his Infants, ſo as by that Inſtruction, his Infant-Seed became Diſciples, and were (accordingly) Sign'd with the Seal of their Stipulating Father's Covenant.

This (undoubtedly) was the Method which the Apoſtles went in, when they were ſent forth to make Diſciples (to Chriſt) in every Nation. They Inſtructed Adult and Grown Perſons in the Myſtery of God's Grace (by Chriſt;) and when ſuch laid hold on Chriſt (in the Covenant) by an External Profeſſion of Faith, (in him) they were Baptized with their Infants, (if any they had.) Hence we Read of the Jaylor in *Acts* 16. 33. who (on his Believing) was Baptized, he and all that were of him, (*viz.*)

(*viz.*) His own Perſonal Off-ſpring, ſo the *Greek* Word ſignifies. Hence alſo we Read of whole Families, who were Baptized (by the Apoſtles) on the Faith of ſuch as were the Heads of ſuch Families. It was no more neceſſary, that Infants ſhould be made mention of, (as being in ſuch Families when Baptized) than it was, that they ſhould be nam'd in the Grand Commiſſion; the Spirit which gave out the Grand Commiſſion, was in, and with the Apoſtles, when they Baptized; and it is (to me) convincing, that Infants are intended in both, ſeeing they are excepted againſt, in neither, which the Adverſary muſt (needs) be convinc'd of, unleſs he be able to prove, that Infants are neither a part of Nations or of Families.

The other Word Teach in the Commiſſion is, *Didaskontes*, which (properly) ſignifies a Teaching or Inſtructing (Doctrinally) thoſe, who are (already) made Diſciples by the former way of Teaching. Neither can it (without Lying) be ſaid to be Nonſenſe and folly, to term Infants (who are by the firſt Teaching made Diſciples) Schollars or Diſciples, ſeeing, that Infants (in Age) are (by the Spirit of Truth) ſo ſtyl'd, witneſs *Acts* 15. 10. where ſuch are called Diſciples, who were made ſo by the Initiating Ordinance of Circumciſion,

who

who afterwards (when grown up) were taught (Doctrinally) what they were to know and practice; neither is this (any whit) repugnant to the Method God took with *Abraham*, but rather agreeing with it; as appears by *Gen.* 18. 19. and even among Men nothing more common and frequent, than to call our little Children Schollars or Disciples, and that from the very first day of their being entred into a School: And as in Mens Schools there are sundry Ranks or Classes of Schollars, some lower and some higher; so in the School of Christ (the great Prophet of his Church) there are several Ranks or Degrees of Church Members. It is well known how ignorant (in the Mysteries of the Gospel) the very Apostles themselves were, when they first entred into Christs School; yet Christ calls them his Disciples for all that. The Apostle *Paul* could not write or speak unto the *Corinthians*, but as unto Babes, as unto Carnal Men; yet they were Church Members for all that. These things duly considered, forces me to conclude those Men profoundly ignorant in the Mystery of Gods Holy Covenant; who (because Infants are uncapable of being taught and instructed (Doctrinally) as adult and grown Men are) peremptorily deny that Infants are capable of being made Disciples (to Christ)

Chriſt) by the Miniſtry of Men. This Principle came (no doubt) from the ſame Spirit which teaches that Infants, (while Infants) are uncapable of Regeneration; which are both (manifeſtly) falſe, becauſe contrary to Gods revealed Will.

Object. 3. *Baptiſm is a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith, to which none have a right, but he or ſhe who is a real true Believer.*

Anſw. I anſwer in three particulars. Firſt, If Baptiſm be a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith, then muſt it needs ſucceed and come in the room of Circumciſion: And ſo the truth is (here) granted, which elſe where is denied, that Circumciſion is a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith; is moſt plain from *Rom.* 4. 11. Now if Baptiſm be a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith, (as the Object or grants, and as I believe and affirm it is) then Baptiſm did (undeniably) come in the room of Circumciſion, that the ſame might be to Believing Gentiles (under the Goſpel) what Circumciſion was (of Old) to *Abraham, (viz.)* a Seal of the Covenant of Grace.

Secondly, If none but actual Believers have a Right to that Righteouſneſs of which Baptiſm is a Seal, then muſt it follow (unavoidably) that all Infants (who Dye in Infancy) are Eternally loſt: And how (cruel this Doctrine is, and how inconſiſtent with

the Doctrine which teacheth that all Infants (Dying Infants) are ſaved, all Men may ſee.

Thirdly, If none but real true Believers have a Right to Baptiſm, I would gladly ſee how thoſe (I Diſpute againſt) can juſtify their own practices, in admitting ſo many poor ignorant Folk to that Ordinance (in their way) who (with ſome who admit them) are as ignorant of the Myſtery of Regeneration and of Baptiſm, (the external Seal thereof) as was *Nicodemus*. Can they (without a Divine Revelation) know that thoſe whom they admit to Baptiſm are (infallibly) real true Believers?

Object. 4. *To apply Baptiſm, (the Seal of the Covenant) to an unintelligent Subject, who neither knows what is done to him, nor yields conſent thereto: It is all one as to preſent a Picture to a Blind Man, which to do is moſt abſurd and ridiculous.*

Anſw. To this I ſhall reply in four particulars. And firſt, I ſay (with a Learned Man) this is (at beſt) but a blind Compariſon; and (which is far worſe) a high and fancy Reflection on the infinite Wiſdom and uncontroulable Soveraignty of the moſt high God; for moſt certain it is, that nothing can be offered as an Argument to keep Infants from Baptiſm, (meerly) on the account of their being unintelligent Subjects,

jects, and uncapable of yielding their conſent to what is done to them in Baptiſm) But what will be of as great force to keep them back from Circumciſion? And ſo the Objector may ſee (plainly) how (herein) he arraigns the Wiſdom and Soveraignty of God at the Bar of a ſhallow and corrupt Creatures Reaſon, which demonſtrates him to be more Brutiſh; (I am ſure more proud and wicked) than thoſe Non-intelligent Subjects which the Objection is levelled againſt.

This will appear by conſidering Gods dealing with *Abraham*, in that he commanded him to Mark (or Seal) his Son *Iſaac* with the Seal of Circumciſion at Eight Days old. Had *Iſaac* the uſe of reaſon at that Age? Had he actual Faith or Speech to expreſs his conſent to what was (then) done to him? No ſure; what then muſt God be charged with weakneſs or unreaſonableneſs for applying the Seal of his Covenant to an unintelligent Subject? By theſe kind of Objectors, Gods Act (herein) ſtands charged with weakneſs and folly, but I conclude with *Paul*, *Rom.* 3. 4. *Yea, let God be true, but every Man a Lyar.* God commands nothing in vain, and the reaſon is, becauſe his Ordinance hath no kind of dependence on the Creature, to give it power, or to make it effectual to accompliſh what he hath

appointed it to, but on his own free Spirit, which works moſt powerfully, yea, irreſiſtably where he himſelf hath purpoſed to confer the Spiritual Good, ſignified by the outward Ordinance.

Object. 5. *The Promiſe of Gods Covenant is made to the Elect, and none but they have a Right to the Seal: No Man can affirm that an Infant brought to Baptiſm is Elect.*

Anſw. I Anſwer to this in two things. Firſt, I grant that none ſhall ever reap any ſaving Benefit by the Covenant, but the Elect; (and that in the right of Election) yet doth it not hence follow, that none but they have a right to the Seal of the Covenant in the Church Viſible, ſeeing that by the very Conſtitution of Gods Covenant (with *Abraham* the Eccleſiaſtical Father, and publick Viſible Head of all the Seed of Believing Church-Members) God commands that the Seal of his Covenant ſhall be equally apply'd to all the Male-Seed of the Believer; and that without any regard to the Election, which is a Secret known (only) to God; about which he would not have us to trouble our Spirits, any farther than to give all (becoming) diligence to make our own (Perſonal) Election ſure to our ſelves. As touching the Infants of Church Members, (about whom all the Diſpute is) We are not (anxiouſly) to be concerned about

bout them, whether they be in the Election of God, yea or no. It is ground ſufficient for us to Bleſs and thank God for his dealing ſo Graciouſly with our Infants, in that they (with us) are taken into the ſame Covenant, and Sealed with the Seal thereof; for by Gods dealing thus with Believers Infant-Seed, Believers have a good foundation laid, whereon to bottom their Hope and Comfort, (with reference to their Dying or Deceaſed Infants) and alſo of wreſtling with God in Prayer for their Converſion and Eternal Welfare; the which the Enemies to Infant-Baptiſm, do (by denying that Infants belong to the Covenant, or have any right to the Promiſes thereof, till they themſelves Believe) deprive, and (inſenſibly) ſpoil themſelves of. This is moſt evidently true, as will appear if it be ſeriouſly conſidered, that all right Prayer is a Pleading the Promiſes of Gods Covenant, in the Name and Merit of Chriſt his own Son, in and through whom, the ſaid Promiſes are intail'd on all the Children of Promiſe: Now if my Infant be Sick or Ailing? If he be going on in Sin, &c. how can I (by the Anabaptiſt Principle put up a Prayer to God for him, ſeeing there is no promiſe of Gods Covenant belongs to him? Or how can I comfort my ſorrowful Spirit (with reference to my

Deceaſed Children) if I muſt look on my dear Babes as Strangers and Enemies to God, (the which they are by Nature; and muſt remain ſo for ever) in caſe they be not Partakers of the Grace of Gods Covenant?

Secondly, If none but the Elect have right to Baptiſm, this Objection will fall like a Mill-ſtone on them who Baptize whole droves of Men and Women; of whoſe Election (to Eternal Life) neither Baptizer nor Baptized, know any more than they know how many Stars in the Firmament; ſo that by thus arguing againſt poor Tongue-ty'd Infants, they may ſee how they deny Salvation to their own (as well as others) Infants, and render themſelves uncapable of diſcharging a good Conſcience to their poor Children, in putting up (daily) Petitions to God for them.

Object. 6. *We have an open Profeſſion from thoſe we Baptize, and that warrants our Baptizing ſuch as offer themſelves to join to the Churches. You have not the like from Infants.*

Anſw. I Anſwer hereto in three particulars. Firſt, it were well for both Baptizers and Baptized, if both the one and the other were better acquainted with the Nature of right Converſion than they are, and that they were better grounded in the ſound (and experimental) knowledge of the Covenant of Grace; the which if they were,

I dare (boldly) ſay, they would not be ſo precipitant and raſh in condemning and deſpiſing thoſe poor Infants, who are ſet forth (by the Wiſdom of God) as Patterns and Examples, by which grown Perſons are to be moulded and fitted for Heaven: Neither would they be ſo forward to offer themſelves to Baptiſm on ſuch ſlight and evanid Motions, as falls ſhort (in too many) of common Convictions.

Secondly, poor Infants never (yet) broke or tranſgreſſed the Moral Law, (Perſonally) and that is one great reaſon why an actual confeſſion of Faith and Repentance is not required of them, to qualifie them for Baptiſm: As the Sin of Infants lyes in the imputation of *Adams* Diſobedience, and the Pollution of Nature, derived by fleſhly Generation; ſo their help and remedy lyes in the imputation of Chriſts Spotleſs Righteouſneſs to their Perſons; and his Spirits renewing their inward Faculties in Regenerating them. And this twofold work of the Spirit in Juſtifying and Sanctifying the Elect Infant, is (plainly) ſignified and Sealed in that Ordinance of Baptiſm, to the Infant, as well as to a grown Believer.

Thirdly, albeit Infants be not able to ſpeak for themſelves, and to claim that right to the Seal of Gods Covenant which the Covenant it ſelf hath entail'd on them,

(as they are the Church Seed of Believing Parents) yet there is one who ſpeaks for them, whoſe Judgment and Teſtimony of them is more ſure and infallible than all other Teſtimonies of Men and Angels; the Lord Jeſus (I mean) who (with his Father, and God the Holy Ghoſt) contrived and made the Covenant of Grace, wherein they are comprehended. I will lay down in ſix Particulars what is the Judgment of Chriſt concerning Infants, (as they are concerned in the Covenant) Firſt, he propounds them as Patterns, by which grown Perſons muſt be moulded and fitted for Heaven, *Mat.* 18. 3. Secondly, declares their right to the Kingdom of God, *Mar* 10. 14. *For of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.* Thirdly, rebukes (moſt ſeverely) his Diſciples for hindering Infants being brought to him, *Mar.* 10. 14. *But when Jeſus ſaw it, he was much diſpleaſed,* &c. In the Greek it is *Eganakteſe,* which ſignifies to have the Bowels (inwardly) moved, or affected with Grief, to be filled with Indignation; (as *Beza* renders it, *Indignatus eſt,* to be Stomackt at a Perſon, or a thing which is greatly or highly diſpleaſing: A Word which judicicus *Sydenham* obſerves, was never uſed by Chriſt in any caſe, or on any occaſion, beſides this of poor Infants, to inſtruct and teach Men: (No doubt) how greatly he

was

was concerned for helpleſs Infants, and how diſpleaſed he was at the hardneſs of his Diſciples Hearts againſt them: Oh! that the conſideration of this might melt the hard Hearts of ſuch, into a Chriſt like tenderneſs towards poor Infants. Fourthly, commands Infants to be brought to him, *Mar.* 10. 14. *Suffer little Children to come unto me*, &c. Fifthly, pronounces them Holy, *Rom.* 11. 16. 1. *Cor.* 7. 14. Sixthly, Bleſſeth them, *Mar.* 10. 16. *And he took them up in his Arms, laid his Hands upon them and Bleſſed them.* Theſe ſix Particulars laid together, and weighed in the Ballance of Gods Sanctuary, I leave it to any Man of Senſe (in Spiritual matters) to judge whether is ſafer to credit this infallible Teſtimony of the Son of God, concerning Infants, than to rely on the bare Teſtimony of a meer Man, concerning himſelf; who may (in all he pretends to) be but a Painted Sepulchre.

Object. 7. *If Infants muſt needs have a right to Baptiſm, becauſe it is a Seal of the Covenant, then (of neceſſity) they muſt have a right to the Lords Supper alſo; for that is a Seal of the Covenant of Grace as well as Baptiſm. The Wine in the Supper might as well be poured down the Infants mouth with a Spoon, as to ſprinkle Water on his face.*

Anſw. This Objection better becomes

a Superannuated Man, who borders on perfect Dotage, than one who pretends to be a Teacher of ignorant and miſguided Souls; and not only ſo, but who takes on him to Uſurp the Seat of Judgment, in paſſing Sentence on all the Holy, Learned and Orthodox Divines, and Proteſtant Martyrs and Churches, who are gone to Glory in the unſhaken Belief that the Infants of Believing Parents have an unqueſtionable right to Baptiſm, and that they are as capable of the Seal of Baptiſm as they are of the Grace of Gods Covenant, ſignified thereby.

But that the Lords Supper belongs to none but to Adult and actual Believers, who are capable of thoſe qualifications required in a worthy Communicant; ſuch as Self-examination, (with reference to his State Godward) his faith in Chriſt, his progreſs in a Holy Life, his diſcerning the Lords Body, his keeping up a lively Communion with Father, Son and Spirit in that Ordinance, and judging ones ſelf in caſe of ſhort coming in Holy Duties.

Theſe are the qualifications required to be in one who comes to the Lords Supper; of which, any (not in a Dream) may judge an Infant cannot be capable, (while an Infant.) I humbly hope no judicious Chriſtian will cenſure me (as raſh and uncharitable) if I judge thoſe Preachers fitter for a Shop-

board

board than a Pulpit, who are not able or willing to diſcern or diſtinguiſh between Milk and ſtrong Meat; and who will deny to Infants the Milk of Holy Baptiſm, (whereof they are capable, and whereto (by Gods Covenant) they have right, becauſe they are uncapable of receiving and digeſting the ſtrong Meat of the Lords Supper.

Object. 8. *If Infant-Baptiſm were God's Ordinance, and were accompanied with his Bleſſing, to the Infant, how comes it to paſs, that ſo many Baptized, (in Infancy) prove ſo Carnal and looſe in their Lives and Converſations?*

Anſw. Hereto I reply in three Particulars, wherewith I ſhall ſhut up the preſent Diſpute.

Firſt, It is with many Believers Infants now (under the Goſpel) as it was with *Abraham* and his Infants of old. Some are their Children by fleſhly Generation only, who (*Iſhmael*-like) prove Mockers and Scoffers at Holineſs, and Haters of God and good Men: Theſe, (notwithſtanding the Relation they ſtand in to the Church, by Virtue of their Baptiſmal Vow and the External Profeſſion they make in the Viſible Church for a time) being left to the darkneſs and folly lodged in their corrupted Nature, they give themſelves over

to all kind of Looſeneſs. Baptiſm (now) is no more to be faulted on this account, than Circumciſion was formerly.

When the Children of believing *Gentiles* do (actually) violate God's Covenant, and depart from him; then will God do with them, as he did with *Abraham*'s Carnal Seed, *&c.*

Secondly, As ſome of the Children of believing Parents, who were Baptiz'd in Infant State, prove looſe and vain, ſo (Bleſſed be God) a great many prove Holy and Upright Walkers with God, manifeſting in their Lives and Converſations, the lively Coppy of that Spiritual Circumciſion wrought (by the Spirit) in their Hearts when Converted, which was Signified and Sealed by that Baptiſm, which they were made Partakers of when Infants.

Thirdly and laſtly, If from the vain and ſinful Practiſe of ſome (Baptiz'd in Infancy) Infant-Baptiſm, muſt be diſallow'd, (as no Inſtitution of God,) how ſtrong an Argument will this prove, to overthrow the Baptizing grown Profeſſors? For (if I miſtake not) the Oppoſers of Infant-Baptiſm muſt own, (will they nill they) that many of thoſe Baptiz'd (in their way) have (notwithſtanding their ſhining Profeſſion, and their high Pretenſions to the Work of the Spirit within) fallen moſt foully, and never recover'd again. And

And thus I have (according to the Wiſdom given from above) endeavoured to clear up, (from God's Word) that *Abraham*'s Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. is (moſt certainly) the Covenant of Grace. I have alſo prov'd (from the ſame Word,) that Circumciſion was the Seal of that Covenant: And that Baptiſm (under the Goſpel) is now ſucceeded (or come in the room) thereof. I have endeavoured to prove, that the Infants of believing *Gentiles* have as real a Right to Baptiſm as *Abraham*'s Seed had to Circumciſion, under that dark Diſpenſation. And whether the Anſwers I have given to the moſt material Objections, I find brought againſt Infant-Baptiſm, be pertinent and convincing, I leave to the Judicious and Unprejudic'd to Judge.

CHAP. V.

AMong all the Raſh and Preſumptuous Aſſertors of Dipping the whole Body under Water, being the only right Mode or Manner of Baptizing, none hath made a greater noiſe (or a fairer ſhew) of being (herein) Infalible, than one *William Ruſſel*, who ſtyles himſelf *Medicinæ Doctor*, *Academiæ Cantabrigienſis.*

This Author, with a more than ordina-

ry

ry Confidence, hath boldly aſſerted, that Dipping, *&c.* is the only right Mode of Baptizing, commanded by Chriſt in the *New Teſtament*, and practiſed by *John* the Baptiſt, and all the Apoſtles and Primitive Chriſtians.

This crude (or raw) Aſſertion of his, he labours to ſupport and make good by a fourfold *Medium*: *Firſt*, The *Etymologie* of the *Greek* word the Holy Ghoſt uſeth to expreſs Dipping by.

Secondly, Thoſe Metaphors uſed in Holy Scriptures, to repreſent it to our Underſtanding.

Thirdly, The Practiſe of the firſt Baptizers.

Fourthly, The words of the Grand Commiſſion given by our Saviour in *Mat.* 28. 19.

To demonſtrate the falſeneſs of his Aſſertion, and to diſcover to Weak and Injudicious People the great Miſtakes, whereon he bottoms his Aſſertion, is the deſign of my preſent Undertaking. But before I attack this *Goliah*, in examining what he can get from the four Particulars (above mentioned,) which may cauſe Simple and empty Brains to think and conceit this Accademical Doctor Invincible and Unanſwerable in what he hath (ſo Peremptorily) aſſerted for the Truth of God. I will

lay

lay down two things, (by way of Premiſe) whereof I deſire the Reader (who is unwilling to be deceiv'd) to take notice.

The firſt is, That not ſo much the bare Letter of Scripture, as the ſenſe and meaning of the Spirit, (therein) is the Word of God; by which Truth and Error are to be Try'd and Judg'd. I have often ſaid, (and I am very bold in affirming, that) that Senſe or Interpretation, which any Man or Men give of any Text of God's Word, which thwarts and contradicts the Analogie of Faith, that Senſe or Interpretation is from the Spirit of Satan; not from God, be the ſame never ſo plauſible and pleaſing to the Sons of Men; and be the Authors never ſo highly eſteem'd of, for both their Piety and Learning. There is a ſweet and an harmonious Concord and Agreement between all the parts of God's Revealed Religion, though but few (Comparatively) can ſee it to be ſo. The Doctrine and Inſtitutions of God in all the particulars of his Inſtituted Worſhip, are plain, eaſy and obvious to the Eye, which the Spirit of Chriſt hath Anointed: But to ſuch Men and Women, who are Deſtitute of the Spirit of Chriſt, nothing in Religion appears to them, but Nonſenſe and ſeeming Contradictions, which is the Reaſon why ſo many thouſands in *England*

land, &c. Stagger and Reel (with a Spiritual *Vertigo*) in the Principles of the Proteſtant Religion, wherein both they and their Anceſtors were Initiated (by Water-Baptiſm;) and in maintaining of which, they ſeemed (for many years) very Zealous.

The ſecond thing I ſhall Premiſe, is this, (*viz.*) That Heterodox and Corrupt Underminers of the Goſpel are then to be moſt of all lookt after and watcht againſt, when they lay about them, to advance the Fame and Credit of the Devil's Miniſters, by Ecclipſing and Darkening the Credit and deſerved Fame of Chriſt's Worthys, whom Chriſt hath Honoured with, being the chief Combatants in the Lord's Battels againſt the Powers of Darkneſs in this World.

My deſign in this, is to diſcover to the unwary Reader, this Doctor's Deſign of Blackening that Renowned and Incomparable Servant of Chriſt, Mr. *John Calvin*, than whom, I verily believe, the World hath not (ſince the Apoſtles left the Earth) ſeen a Greater Divine. A Man, who (for his high and excellent Endowments in all manner of Learning, eſpecially his Eagle-eyedneſs, in penetrating into the Senſe of Scriptures) was more like a Prophet, or an Apoſtle, than an ordinary Preacher.

This

This Doctor, that he might put a Luſtre on *Michael Servetus* his Name, draws the Pencil of horrid and black Reproach acroſs the Name and Reputation of Holy, and (as I ſaid) Incomparable *Calvin*. The Devil (in his Miniſters) being deeply ſenſible how the famous and elaborate Works of that one Man ſtand in the way, to prevent and hinder the Devil growing Rampant, in advancing his Kingdom of Darkneſs among the Sons of Men.

Calvin is (by the Dr.) repreſented as an ambitious, Self ſeeking Man; and (which is far worſe) a bloody Perſecuter, while his *Servetus* is deckt and adorned with the Robes of a Glorious Martyrdom. The Drs. Words will ſhew whether I be miſtaken in what I ſay of him, ſee Page 4 of the Drs. Epiſtle, where he ſaith, (with a Spirit of virulency) and at laſt I concluded it muſt certainly proceed from the very Spirit and Principle of the firſt founder of your Sect, (meaning the *Presbyterians*) Maſter *John Calvin*, who burnt the Books of *Servetus*, a Learned Baptiſt, and afterwards perſwaded the Magiſtrates of *Geneva* to Burn him alive; which Sentence was executed upon him, (as *Caſtellio* teſtifies, (who was a contemporary with him) In theſe words *Michael Servetus* was burnt alive for his Opinion, at *Geneva*, 1553, upon the 27th day of *October*. Beſides

Beſides this, The Dr. tells his Reader, (with an ungodly deſign, to leſſen and blacken the Famous *Calvin*; and to Extol his *Servetus*,) that one well obſerves, that Mr. *Calvin* did acknowledge of *Servetus*, that he was a Learned Charitable Man; notwithſtanding which, he wrote a Book to Juſtifie *Servetus* being put to Death.

When I See and Read theſe things, from a better, and more Impartial Teſtimony than *Caſtellio* was, I ſhall then ſay ſomewhat to it. But (indeed) I muſt Ingeniouſly aſſure the Dr. that I ſhall neither believe him, nor his *Caſtellio*, in the Reports they ſpread abroad of *Calvin*, and others (of Chriſt's Worthys) who Detect and Decry their Heretical Doctrines.

Not him, becauſe ſad Experience Teaches, that thoſe of his Judgement are pretty well Skilled, in Miſrepreſenting and Belying the moſt Holy, Orothodox, and moſt Learned of Divines; on purpoſe to gain Ground among the leſs Intelligent, whom they know to be ſtrangers to Authors; and who will be eaſily drawn to Credit thoſe Reports, which they are not able to contradict: Eſpecially when Repreſented to them, by the Mouth and Pen, of ſuch, as they take to be good Men.

Not his *Caſtellio*, becauſe I look on him every way as unfit to be a Witneſs

again

againſt ſo Orthodox and great a Propugnator of Goſpel Verities, as *Calvin* is known to be; And that, on the Account of the Teſtimonies given of *Caſtellio*; by good and Learned Men, who better knew what *Caſtellio* was than Dr. *Ruſſel* doth.

The Great and Learned *Scaliger* charges *Caſtellio*, with holding many corrupt Opinions of the Anabaptiſts.

And the Learned *Hoffman* Accuſed him for being one of the firſt Sowers of the Seed of *Arminianiſm*.

Tar. Faber, another Great and Learned Author, Charged him with ſaying that the Song of *Solomon* was a Wicked Book. And he held that *Paul* Taught a more Myſterious Divinity to ſome perfect Diſciples, than he left in Wri ing, this is to be ſeen in his Book, on the Firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*.

Now if the Impartial Reader, ſeriouſly weighs the Account given of *Calvin* and *Caſtellio*, by the Orthodox and Learned, he will ſoon conclude (with me,) That had the Parts and Learning of *Servetus* and *Caſtellio* both Concenter'd in one Head, *Calvin's* Orthodoxy in the Faith, and his Excellency in all manner of Learning, had never been in danger of Suffering an Eclipſe: Nor yet his Books of receiving a Solid Anſwer (much leſs a Confutation) by

ſuch

ſuch Men as *Servetus* and *Caſtellio*, whatever Dr. *Ruſſel* and his Bigotted Proſelites think or believe to the Contrary.

That Eagle Eyed *Calvin*, ſoared too High (in Penetrating into the *Arcana Imperii* of Heaven) for ſuch Glow-worms to reach his Senſe, or to underſtand the Spirit by which he Speaks and Writes. *Wiſdom is Juſtified of none but her own Legitimate Off-ſpring.* Mat. 11. 19.

And here I deſire the wary Reader, to take notice of the fraudulent deſign of Dr. *Ruſſel*, which is, to Impoſe on his Reader, a believing that *Servetus* (who dy'd at *Geneva* for his Opinion) did Dye for being an Anabaptiſt: which indeed is a notorious Piece of Falſhood, as the Learned and Godly (who look into Antiquity) well know, who give that Account of *Servetus*, that he was Executed at *Geneva* for his Blaſphemy againſt the Holy Trinity, he Denying the God-Head of Chriſt, and the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt.

This the Dr. well knew would have ſpoiled his deſign, had he (honeſtly) told his Reader, what an Heterodox and Blaſphemous Wretch, his *Servetus*, that Learned Baptiſt (who Dy'd at *Geneva* for his Opinion) was.

And truly, (to be plain,) had *Servetus* Dy'd for being an Anabaptiſt (which I utterly

terly deny he did,) yet, I am far from thinking the better of Anabaptiſm therefore: Or, Judging *Servetus*, (or any others who on that Account looſe their Lives) to be true Martyrs of Jeſus.

That ſaying of *Cyprian* will ever be true, that *Cauſa, non Mors, facit Martirem*, The Cauſe, not Death, makes a Martyr. As the Bleſſed Jeſus hath his Witneſſes, who Seal the Word of his Patience, with their deareſt Blood.

So the Devil hath his Witneſſes, (yea, many more than Chriſt hath,) who Seal their Infernal Hereſies, and Damnable Doctrines, with their Hearts Blood; yet I am far from Believing that ſuch Martyrs, will ever be owned by Chriſt, at their going off the Stage: Or, that ſuch Sufferings will make better the horrid Lyes and Blaſphemies Men Suffer for, be their Conſtancy, ſeeming Zeal, and Courage what it will.

Having Premiſed theſe things, I now proceed, to Examine the Four Particulars, whereon his Fabrick of Anabaptiſm ſeems to be Founded.

The Dr. and (with him all Anabaptiſts) Hold, (and with great Confidence) Aſſert: that Dipping and Plungeing the whole Body under Water, is the Only Right manner

manner of Baptiſm, which all Believers are to practiſe under the Goſpel.

This he labours, (though in vain) to make good by the Etymologie of the word, which the Spirit uſes to expreſs Baptiſm by: The word (in the Greek) is Βαπτίζω, which (ſaith the Dr.) is derived from Βάπτω to Dip or Plunge a thing under water. This ſignification of the Primitive word Βάπτω, he confirms by Human Teſtimony; he begins with Learned Mr. *Leigh*, to whoſe *Critica Sacra* he refers his Reader, in Quoting whom, he deals with his Reader as he did in Quoting *Servetus*; he ſaith that *Servetus* Dy'd at *Geneva* for his Opinion, but hides from his Reader the horrid Blaſphemies for which he Dyed: So here the Dr. (deſignedly) Curtails the Obſervations of Mr. *Leigh* on the word Βαπτίζω, telling his Reader ſo much out of Mr. *Leigh* as he thinks makes for his Cauſe, but leaving out what of Mr. *Leigh* he knows makes full againſt him; which (I muſt needs ſay) is the trick of a Deceiver: And by theſe kind of ſhifts he and the moſt Crafty of his Party, do endeavour to underprop their ſinking Cauſe, bearing poor ſimple folk in hand, that the Eminently Learned and Godly Men (whom they Quote) were of the Anabaptiſts Perſwaſion.

Now

Now to let his unfairneſs appear herein, I here ſet down what of *Leigh* he quotes, and what of him he omits.

The word Βαπτίζω (ſaith Mr. *Leigh*, is derived from the word Βάπτω, *Tingo*, to Dip or Plunge into the Water; and ſignifieth (primarily) ſuch a kind of waſhing as is uſed in Bucks, where Linnen is plunged and dipt. Thus far the Dr. Quotes *Leigh*, and who would not think by reading ſo much of *Leigh*, and looking no further, (as the Dr. no doubt would have his Reader) but that *Leigh* in his *Critica Sacra* was of the Drs. judgment herein.

Now follows the Learned *Leighs* Obſervations on the ſignification of the word Βαπτίζω. yet (ſaith he) it is taken more largely (meaning *Baptizo*) for any kind of waſhing, rinſing or cleanſing, even where there is no Dipping at all; for which he Quotes *Mat.* 3. 11. *I indeed Baptize you with Water*, &c. *Mat.* 20. 22. *Are ye able to be Baptized with*, &c. *Mar.* 7. 4. *And when they come from the Market, except they waſh they eat not.* Luke 3. 16. Acts 1. 5. Acts 11. 16. and 1. *Cor.* 10. 2. In all which Scriptures Mr. *Leigh* doth acknowledge that Βαπτίζω (the Derivative) is of a larger ſignification then Βάπτω its Primative, and intends ſuch a waſhing as is done without

without Dipping; and why ſhould this be concealed from the Reader?

As for *Zeppeorus*, *Alſtedius*, *Plutarch* and *Nazianzen*, (on whom the Dr. lays no ſmall ſtreſs) I hope he will allow us the ſame liberty he takes to himſelf, (*viz.*) to Quote ſuch Teſtimonies as make for us.

The Learned Dr. featly (Quoted by Mr. *Leigh*) tells us that Chriſt no where requireth Dipping, but only Baptizing; which word (ſaith he) *Heſychius*, *Stephanus*, *Scapula* and *Budeus*, the great Maſters of the Greek Tongue) make good by very many Inſtances and Allegations out of Claſſick Writers, that the word importeth no more then Ablution or Waſhing, Βαπτίζω (ſay they) in their Lexicons and Commentaries) *Lavo* βάπτισμα *Lavatio*, *Ablutio*, which may be done without Dipping.

As touching the Greek Lexicon, Publiſht, and recommended by.

Joſeph Caryl,	} {	Matthew Barker,
George Cokayne,	} {	William Adderly,
Ralph Venning,	} {	Matthew Mead,
William Dell,	} {	Henry Jeſſey.

All that I ſhall (or need to) ſay, is this, (*viz.*) that albeit I own my ſelf bound to Reverence and Honour the hoary Head, when found in the way of Truth and Righteouſneſs, yet it muſt ſtill be with the reſervation of the honour and reſpect which

I owe to God, (that Ancient of Days) their Father and mine, who alone and not the Learning and Wiſdom of Men, (though the Greateſt and Holieſt) is the Father of their Faith and mine. I am not inſenſible that ſome Learned and good Men have granted, that the word Βαπτίζω doth indifferently ſignifie, any kind of Waſhing by pouring out or ſprinkling Water upon, or, by Dipping or Plunging into the Water; and this they have grounded on the native Signification of the Primitive word Βάπτω. But with becoming modeſty and due veneration to their Reverend Names, I muſt crave leave in telling the World, that for a World I cannot be of their Opinion (herein) until I receive greater and clearer light from the Spirit and Word of God, concerning this matter; and that for the reaſons here following. Firſt, the apparent difference I find between the two Words, Βάπτω and Βαπτίζω, in Letters and Syllables, let the words be obſerved, in Βάπτω (the Primitive) I can find but 2 Syllables, Βάπ-τω, *Bap-to*, but in the Derivative Βαπτίζω I find three, Βαπ-τί-ζω, *Baptizo*, and as in the Active, (ſo alſo in the Paſſive) Voice, Βάπτομαι, *Bap-to-mai* hath three Syllables, whereas Βαπτίζομαι which is the Paſſive of Βαπτίζω, hath four Syllables, Βαπ-τί-ζο-μαι *Bap-ti-zo-mai*. Now that the 2 words ſhould both

In Active and Passive Voice so apparently differ in Letters, Syllables, and sound of the words; and yet, that both the words should signifie and import the very same thing, is to me such a Riddle, that indeed I cannot see how the same can be unfolded, unless by the elucidating Art, and skill of Dr. *Russel*. The Learned know (very well) that in the Hebrew and Greek Tongues, the change of a Letter or a Syllable doth greatly alter the Sense and Import of Words; and why it should not be so here, I cannot see any solid reason to the contrary, only it is the Will and Pleasure of our Dr. (and his Adherents in this Cause) that it must and shall be so, right or wrong; as appears by his Arminian Confidence almost in every Page where he mentions the Word Baptize; where he (peremptorily) beggs the Question, taking for granted, that which will never be granted by any, (unless by Brainless Heads or wilful underminers of the Gospel, (*viz.*) that the Derivative Βαπτίζω doth always (in the Gospel) signifie and import the very same thing with *Bapto*, (*viz.*) to Dip or Plunge the whole Body under Water.

But that which will farther clear the matter, and put the Truth (I here contend for) out of the reach of all Scriptural Contradiction, is the Practice of the Holy Ghost, who

who is a better Etymologiſt than our Dr. and then all the Arminian (and other Heretical) Criticks, who (in pretence of giving the Native and Genuine ſenſe of Words in the Scripture) have forc't a wrong ſenſe from the Original, on purpoſe to lay a firm foundation, on which they may build their Heterodox, and Soul deluding Doctrines.

I find that when the Holy Ghoſt would expreſs the Act of Dipping or Plunging into, he doth it only by the Primitive Βάπτω, never by the Derivative Βαπτίζω that I can find: For Proof whereof, let thoſe Scriptures (Quoted by the Dr. himſelf in Page 11.) be without prejudice lookt into, and ſeriouſly weighed. *Rev.* 19. 13. *He had his Veſture dipt in Blood.* Mat. 26. 23. *He that dippeth his hand with me in the Diſh.* Luke 16. 24. *That he may dip the tip of his finger in Water.* And in John 13. 26. it is (ſaith the Dr.) twice uſed, Βάψας Dipped, καὶ ἐμβάψας, *and when he had Dipped*: Here in theſe places the Holy Ghoſt expreſſeth the Act Dip or Plunge into by the Primitive Βάπτω, but never by Βαπτίζω, *Baptizo* the Derivative.

Secondly, again (on the contrary) when the Holy Ghoſt expreſſeth Baptiſm by waſhing, he doth it by the Derivative βαπτίζω, but never by the Primitive βάπτω, *Bap-*

12. For Proof hereof, let the places of Scripture already quoted (out of *Leigh's Critica Sacra*) be consulted, in all which places the Spirit speaks of Baptism, but not a word of Dipping; and that by the Derivative word βαπτίζω, *Baptizo*; never by the Primitive *Bapto*.

Seeing then it hath pleased the Holy Ghost to express Dipping or Plunging into by the word βάπτω, but never by the word βαπτίζω, *Baptizo*; and that he hath expressed Baptism by the word βαπτίζω, but never by the word βάπτω. I think none but Fools or mad Men will blame me for resolving to believe the Holy Ghost (in this matter) before I believe Dr. *Russel*, and all the human Testimonies he hath quoted to make good his Cause: though he were able to quote a Million of Authors as Witty and Learned as his so much admired *Servetus* and *Castellio*.

The Premisses considered, I hope the Dr. will not be displeased for making this fair and generous offer to him, and all who espouse his Unscriptural Cause, (*viz.*) that if he (or they) can shew such a solid and convincing reason (as doth not contradict the Analogie of Faith) why (or wherefore) the Holy Ghost should not in any of those Scriptures (where he expresseth Dipping) express Dipping by βαπτίζω the Derivative, but

but only by βάπτω the Primitive; and why he ſhould not expreſs Baptiſm in any of the places of Scripture above quoted, by the Primitive βάπτω, *Bapto*, but always by *Baptizo*, in caſe both βάπτω the Primitive, and βαπτίζω its Derivative do ſignifie the very ſame thing, (*viz.*) to Dip or Plunge under the Water: And I do faithfully promiſe him to own my ſelf miſtaken, and him to be (herein) in the right.

If he cannot, I then hope his miſguided Proſelytes as well as himſelf, will ingeniouſly own themſelves miſtaken, and perſiſt no longer in fighting againſt the truth of God.

From the difference between the two words in Letters, Syllables and Sound; as alſo from the Practice of the Holy Ghoſt, in uſing both the words in the N. T

I thus Argue, Major. If the words βάπτω and βαπτίζω do apparently differ in Letters, Syllables and Sound, and if the Holy Ghoſt do always expreſs the Act of Dipping and Plunging by *Bapto*, never by *Baptizo*; and Baptiſm by *Baptizo*, never by *Bapto*; then the word *Bapto* muſt ſignifie to Dip and Plunge, but never to Baptize; and the word *Baptizo* muſt ſignifie to Baptize, but never to Dip or Plunge under Water.

Aſſump. *But the words* Bapto and Baptizo *do apparently differ in Letters, Syllables*

and Sound; and the Holy Ghost doth always express the Act of Dipping or Plunging by Bapto, *never by* Baptizo; *and Baptism by* Baptizo, *never by* Bapto.

Conclusion, *Ergo* the word *Bapto* must signifie to Dip or Plunge, but never to Baptize; and the word *Baptizo* must signifie to Baptize, but never to Dip or Plunge under Water.

Besides this Argument, others shall be laid down to confirm this when I come to speak to his third, (*viz.*) the Practice of the first Baptizers.

In the 2d place, our Dr. will have Baptizing to be only by Dipping or Plunging the whole Body under Water: The Proof he gives (to make good his Assertion herein) are those Metaphors used in Holy Scripture: To represent it to our understanding, he Instances in two, in Page 8, (*viz.*) Burial and Resurrection.

He tells his Reader there, that our Lord Jesus hath not burdened us under the Gospel with a multitude of Ceremonies, as it was in the Oeconomy of the Jews under the Legal Dispensation, but only with some few; and those very Significant, this being a more Spiritual Dispensation. Before I meddle in speaking to his Metaphors, I will take liberty to tell the World, that altho' Christ doth not burden us with a multitude

titude of Ceremonies now, as under the Oeconomy of the Jews under the Legal Diſpenſation; yet this one Ceremonie (of Baptiſm) will prove a heavier Yoke to Believers now then Circumciſion with all the whole Body of Ceremonies appertaining to that Legal Diſpenſation, in caſe it muſt be Adminiſtred by Dipping and Plunging the whole Body under Water, as Anabaptiſts ſay it muſt.

I come now to his Metaphors, the firſt whereof (he ſaith) is that of a Burial: For this, he and all of his Perſwaſion quote *Rom.* 6. 4. and *Coloſ.* 2. 12. *Buried with him in Baptiſm unto Death.* From this Metaphor of a Burial the Dr. and all his Party do hold and teach (for an infallible truth) that the Scope and Deſign of the Apoſtle in the two places (now quoted) is to teach and ſet forth the mode and manner how Chriſt was Buried, to the end Believers ſhould (in Baptiſm) imitate the ſame: This (if I miſtake them not, as I am very confident I do not) is the ſenſe and meaning wherein he and all Anabaptiſts take thoſe Scriptures.

In Anſwer to whom, I affirm that this their ſenſe of thoſe places is ſenſeleſs, and meerly forc't to ſerve their own turn, in proving that Dipping and Plunging (in Baptiſm) is the only true and right Baptiſm.

Now to diſcover their Miſtake and Error

herein, I ſhall offer but two things to conſideration.

The firſt is, to ſhew the Scope and Deſign of the Apoſtle in thoſe places, which is not (as they fondly and injudiciouſly imagine) to ſhew that Chriſt was Baptized by dipping, or that Believers are to be ſo Baptized.

But the Scope and Deſign of the Apoſtle in thoſe places, is to ſet forth and prove that Suretyſhip Union, which is between Chriſt (the Mediatorial Head) and all the Members of his Body Myſtical; there being no one Act of Obedience, either Active or Paſſive, which Chriſt (the Mediator) performed in the aſſumed Nature, but all his Members are ſaid to do and perform the ſame; and all the Effects and Saving Benefits thereof do undoubtedly redound to all the Elect: and all this is Signified and Sealed in Baptiſm to every Elected Sinner, whether Infant or Adult. And I cannot but reckon it a ſtrange Infatuation on thoſe who lay ſuch ſtreſs on the *Dutch* Tranſlators, in the point of *John* the Dooper, (wherein ſilly and weak People do not a little Glory and Brag) that they ſhould put ſuch Sleights and Contempt on the *Dutch* Annotators, thoſe great Lights of the World, in matter of Infants right to Baptiſm, of *Abraham*'s Covenant being a Covenant of abſolute Grace, of Circumciſion being the Initial

Seal

Seal thereof, and Baptiſm ſucceeding in the room thereof; with ſundry other material points in Goſpel Religion, wherein they are Sound and Orthodox: Yet, in nothing muſt our Dr. and his Adherents make uſe of the *Dutch*, only *John the Dooper*, *John the Dooper*: And in this Commiſſion, *de Salve Dopende*, Dipping them.

And what ground hath our Dr. to conclude, that had our *Engliſh Tranſlators* turned the words (about Baptiſm) into Dipping, as the *Dutch* Tranſlators have done? (If it be as he ſaith) that therefore it muſt (neceſſarily) be ſo in the Original, or how will he prove the *Dutch* Tranſlators nearer to Infallibility than our *Engliſh* Tranſlators were? or that our *Engliſh* Tranſlators would have been more Infallible than they were, in caſe they had Tranſlated *John* the *Baptiſt Johannes de Dooper*; and in the Commiſſion *Baptizing them*, *de Salve Dopende* Dipping them.

Secondly, if to imitate and ſet forth Chriſts Burial, be the deſign of the Apoſtle, then muſt it (neceſſarily) follow that it is Mens duty to imitate it in all the Circumſtances of a Burial, as well as in ſome. Chriſt when he was Buried, he was wholly Paſſive; he did not go into the Grave himſelf, but was laid in by others; ſo muſt Perſons be in Baptiſm, they muſt be wholly

Native, they must not go into the Water themselves, but must be laid under the Water by the Administrator of Baptism: Christ when Buried was left in the Grave, so must the Person in Baptism; he must be left under the Water as long as Christ continued in the Grave, which was three Days and three Nights.

If any shall say it is absurd and ridiculous to think or say, that these Circumstances should be attended or imitated by Believers in Water-Baptism, I say so too; ad do farther say and affirm, that it is (altogether) as absurd and ridiculous for any to affirm and teach, that for Believers to set forth and imitate Christs Burial is the Apostles design in the above-mentioned Scriptures: If Anabaptists will be peremptory in asserting and teaching that to set forth and imitate Christs Burial in those places, is the scope and design of the Apostle, they must give me leave to be as peremptory as they in affirming, that unless they imitate Christs Burial in the Circumstances now mentioned, their Baptism (about which so great and confused a noise is made in the World) is but a meer ludicrous (or mock) Baptism, for that they do not imitate Christ in their Baptism in those Circumstances which are so essentially necessary to set

forth

forth and repreſent his Death and Burial, in caſe it be as they hold it is.

To which I add, that our Baptizing by pouring out or ſprinkling Water on the Subject, doth (every way) more exactly repreſent and ſet forth a Burial, than that of Dipping and Plunging the whole Body under Water.

The truth of this will appear, if the Particulars following be ſeriouſly and without prejudice conſidered.

Firſt, In Dipping and Plunging into the Water, the Party Baptized, is Active, in going himſelf into the Water, which (indeed) ought not to be the Ordinance of Water-Baptiſm, being (in all reſpects) a Paſſive Ordinance, wherein the Subject is to be wholly Paſſive, as the Soul is in the Work of Regeneration.

The Work of Converſion or Regeneration is the Inward and Spiritual Baptiſm Adminiſtred by Chriſt. In this wonderful Work, the Dead Sinner hath no hand in effecting or producing the ſame, it is wholly done by Chriſt, the Adminiſtrator thereof. So in the outward Ordinance of Water-Baptiſm, (which is no more than the outward Sign or Seal of the Inward) the Miniſter of the Goſpel (in Adminiſtring Baptiſm) muſt only be Active, the Subject muſt put forth no Act at all. The Party

being

going himself into the Water, doth not represent and set forth a Dead Man, in Pouring out or Sprinkling Water on the Subject, the Party is wholly Passive, as is a Dead Man when Buried. Again, in Dipping and Plunging the Party Baptized, is applyed to the Water, not the Water to the Party, which is contrary to the manner of Burials, which all Men know is to lay the Corps on its Back in the Grave, and to Pour out or Sprinkle the Earth on it.

In Baptizing by Sprinkling or Pouring out Water, the Party is laid on his Back, and the Water poured out or sprinkled on him.

The Party Dead is never thrust into the Earth, but the Earth or Mould is poured out on him.

Now, whether of these two ways of Baptizing by Dipping and Plunging, or that of Pouring out or Sprinkling Water upon, do more lively and exactly set forth and represent a Burial, let any (who have not lost their Senses) Judge.

As to the second Metaphor, (*viz.*) A Resurrection, I humbly conceive, that what here follows may suffice to shew, that as Anabaptists do not (at all) hold forth or represent the Death and Burial of Christ in their going into the Water (in their way)

so,

so, neither do they set forth and represent his Resurrection, as they fancy they do.

First, It is most certain, that when the time (determined by God's Decree) for Christ's remaining in a State of Death was accomplisht, (according to the Holy Scriptures,) he raised up himself from the Grave. No Hand of Men or Angels helpt to raise him. So that plain it is, if the Scriptures they alledge for this, be to be taken in a literal Sense, then must it needs follow, that as he that Administers Baptism (by Dipping or Burying the whole Body under Water,) doth Administer Baptism in that way of Burying under the Water, to the end the Party so Baptized might lively set forth the Death and Burial of Christ; so he must leave the Party Buried in the Water, to raise up himself, that so he might represent Christ in his raising up himself from the Grave. If this were practised, it would not be hard to guess, how many Proselites they would get to join with them in this their Fantastical new Mode of Baptizing. And truly, for my part, I cannot see how they can be excused from doing the one as well as the other, seeing that the Metaphor must be Prosecuted in all its parts, as well as in some. And thus they may see what they are like

to

to get, by building their Confidence on misunderstood and wrested Metaphors.

I come now to the Doctor's third *Medium*, whereby he labours to prove, that the right way of Baptizing under the Gospel, is (and must be) by Dipping and Plunging the whole Body under Water, (*viz.*) The Practice of the first Baptizers. In this he is as full of Confidence as he was in the other two; I have now dismist, and I hope in the Goodness of God it will plainly be demonstrated, that (in this also) he and his Adherents do pervert the Scriptures, which gives us the account of the first Baptizers, as they (most certainly) do the other Scriptures, which they bring to justifie and make good their Soul deluding Dreams.

He begins with *John* the *Baptist*, Page 10. where he tells his Reader, that it doth appear that Dipping is the right way of Baptizing from the first Baptizers: The first mention (saith he) of this Ordinance of Holy Baptism, we have in *Mat.* 3. 1. where *John* the Dipper is mentioned; and so he goes on in a strange kind of Rapsody, warbling out his so much affected Note, Dipping and Plunging. I shall not be concerned to follow the Dr. (*Pedetentim*) step by step in his *Pedantick* way, least I should be found guilty of the same empty Tautologies.

logies wherewith his ſo much admired Epiſtle abounds.

The ground of his miſtake herein, is the wrong Etymology he gives of the word βαπτίζω, which he and his miſtaken Teſtimonies take to ſignifie and mean Dipping and Plunging the whole Body under Water.

This Etymologie of his I have overthrown, as the Reader may ſee, if he look back to the firſt Head of the Diſpute, (*viz.*) the Etymologie of the word βαπτίζω. I ſhall not repeat but go on to confirm the truth of the Etymologie I have given of the word βαπτίζω, from the word of God, and the beſt Greek Authors, by ſuch Arguments as (I hope in Chriſt) will prove irrefragable.

The firſt ſhall be grounded on the neceſſity of *John Baptiſt*, his Harmonizing with the Pen-men of the *Old-Teſtament* in all the parts of his Miniſtry, if the Dr. will grant (as he muſt) if he ſpeak truth that his *John the Dooper* was a true and faithful Prophet of God, he muſt of neceſſity grant that *John* did run parallel with *Moſes* and the other Prophets.

This the Dr. muſt either grant or deny, if he grant that *John* did run exactly parallel with *Moſes* and the other Prophets, then is it beyond all contradiction that *John* adminiſtred Baptiſm by pouring out

or

or ſprinkling Water on the Perſons he Baptized; for moſt certain it is, that *Moſes* (under the Ceremonial Diſpenſation) did apply all the Legal Waſhings and Purifications by Water, (which all had a Typical relation to Chriſt to come, as *John*'s Baptiſm alſo had) by pouring out or ſprinkling the Water: The Prophets alſo, (witneſs thoſe two great Prophets *Eſa.* and *Ezek.*) they foretold of the manner how God would apply to his People the two great Benefits accrewing by his Sons Mediatorial Sacrifice, (*viz.*) Juſtification and Sanctification, which was to be by Sprinkling, as will evidently appear by *Eſa.* 52. 15. *Then ſhall he Sprinkle many Nations*, &c. and *Ezek.* 36. 25. *Then will I Sprinkle clean Water upon you*, &c. In theſe places the Spirit of Chriſt (in his Prophets) had an Eye to the Baptiſmal Waſhings of the *New-Teſtament* Diſpenſation. Now if *John Baptiſt* did (in all the parts of his Miniſtry) Harmonize with *Moſes* and the other Prophets, he did (undoubtedly) Baptize by pouring out or ſprinkling Water on thoſe he Baptized; for moſt certain it is, (as hath been already obſerved) pouring out or ſprinkling was the mode or way of application of all the Ceremonial Waſhings which were uſed before *John*'s Baptiſm.

If the Dr. and his Adherents deny that

John

John did run (exactly) parallel with *Moſes* and the other Pen-men of Holy Scriptures, then is *John the Dooper* (by them) made a falſe Prophet; and all who (from *John*) take up and practiſe the mode of Dipping the whole Body under Water, (as the only right Baptiſm) are Self-condemned in that they do (herein) follow one who contradicted the Spirit of God in the other Prophets.

And ſo (hereby) it appears how much *John* the *Baptiſt* is obliged to the Dippers of our Age, who, (rather than they will loſe their ſilly Opinion) will have the Spirit of Truth to ſpeak Nonſenſe, (yea, contradict himſelf) and *John* the greateſt of all the other Prophets, (becauſe the immediate fore-runner of Chriſt) to be a falſe Prophet.

This Stain they will never be able to waſh off their Name, any other way than by honeſtly acknowledging that *John* did (in all the parts of his Miniſtry) Harmonize with *Moſes* and the other Prophets, the which if they once grant, (as they muſt if they ſpeak by the Holy Ghoſt) then is their Cauſe loſt, and *John* no more to be Stiled *John the Dooper*, but *John* the Baptizer.

From what hath been ſaid, I argue thus, if *John Baptiſt* did (in all the parts of his Mini-

Miniſtry) Harmonize and agree with *Moſes* and the other Prophets, then did he adminiſter Baptiſm by pouring out or ſprinkling Water upon thoſe he Baptized: But *John Baptiſt* did (in all the parts of his Miniſtry) Harmonize and agree with *Moſes* and the other Prophets.

Therefore *John Baptiſt* did adminiſter Baptiſm by pouring out or ſprinkling Water on thoſe he Baptized.

A ſecond Argument ſhall be grounded on impoſſibility, thus, that way of Baptizing which is impoſſible to be practiſed (without a miraculous ſtrength of Body) was never commanded by Chriſt, nor practiſed by *John*; but to Baptize the many Multitudes which came to *John*'s Baptiſm, by Dipping the whole Body under Water, was a thing altogether impoſſible, ſeeing *John* had no miraculous ſtrength of Body to render him capable of ſuch an arduous and difficult Adminiſtration.

Therefore that way of Baptizing, by Dipping the whole Body under Water, was never commanded by Chriſt, nor practiſed by *John*.

The major Propoſition will not be denyed, the Aſſumption will readily be ſubſcribed, (as an unqueſtionable truth) if Men who plead for that way of Dipping will be but ingenious in doing two things. Firſt,

in

in lifting up in their Arms (cleverly from the Earth) the many Corpulent Bodies which offer themſelves to Baptiſm, lay them under the Water, and there hold them until the Adminiſtrator pronounce the words of Inſtitution, *I Baptize thee in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* Secondly, in ſincerely acknowledging what experience teaches them concerning this Practice; theſe two Particulars comply'd in, will (I doubt not) put the matter now in Debate out of all Queſtion, that to Baptize in that way of taking up in the Arms, and laying under Water the moſt Corpulent Bodies who offer to Baptiſm, and to hold them under the Water till the words of Inſtitution be pronounced; is a thing altogether impoſſible, not only in reſpect of the Adminiſtrator, whoſe Bodily Strength muſt (in an ordinary way) ſink and fail in lifting and holding up (ſo long) ſuch maſſy, ponderous weights: And alſo in reſpect of the Subject, who muſt (undoubtedly) be in great fear and in apparent danger of being let fall, if not of being Suffocated or Smothered in the Water.

And ſtrange it is to me, that Arminians, who plead ſo much for the univerſal Love and Mercy of God to Mankind (in general,) ſhould not ſee how full of Reflection

on God, this Principle of theirs is, which makes the God of Love and Mercy, the Author of such a Mode or Way of Baptizing, which is not possible to be practised, without apparent Danger, both to Health and Life, of both the Subject and the Administrator too.

I conclude this Argument with the Saying of Judicious *Sydenham*, (viz.) *That if Baptism be to be Administred in that way of Dipping only, Happy are those who live in hot Climates, or who have Bodies of Braß.*

A third Argument may be grounded on *Scandal*, thus; That Mode or Way of Baptizing, which is both Immodest and tends to Excite Lustful Motions and Carnal Desires in Men and Women, cannot be commanded by Christ; neither was the same ever practised by *John*. But that way of Baptizing by Dipping the whole Body under Water, is both Immodest and tends to Excite Lustful Motions and Carnal Desires in Men and Women.

Therefore that Mode of Baptizing by Dipping the whole Body under Water, was never commanded by Christ, neither was the same ever practised by *John*.

He who commands all Matters (relating to Divine Worship) to be done decently, and in order, 1 *Cor.* 14. 40. and who commands Believers to abstain from all appear-

pearance of Evil, 1 *Thes.* 5. 22. can never be the Author of such Disorderly Practises, as thwart and contradict his own general Rules. Now, whether it be not an Immodest and unseemly Sight, to see a mixt Company of Men and Women stand in Garments, (to use Mr. *Sydenham*'s Expression) next to Nakedness it self: Let any (not bereav'd of common Modesty) Judge: And whether the Administrator can (possibly) handle the Female Sex, as he doth (when actually Dipping them,) and not feel the risings and motions of Concupiscence in his Nature; I leave to Thinking Persons to Determine and Judge.

Again, in the fourth place, (to add no more) let the last Argument be grounded on the *Analogie*, which is (and must be) between the Baptism of *John* and that of Christ. The Argument is thus framed.

If Christ's way and manner of Administring the Inward Spiritual Baptism (whereof that of *John* was but the Outward Visible Sign) be by Sprinkling or Pouring out upon: Then *John* did (certainly) Baptize by Sprinkling or Powering out the Water on those he Baptized:

But Christ's way and manner of Administring the Inward Spiritual Baptism, is by Sprinkling or Pouring out upon.

Therefore *John* did (certainly) Baptize by Sprinkling or Pouring out Water on those he Baptized.

If there was a neceſſity that *John* ſhould Harmonize with *Moſes*, the Ceremonial Law and the Prophets, I cannot ſee any reaſon why he ſhould not be as greatly concern'd to Harmonize with Chriſt himſelf: And ſeeing that the manner of Chriſt's Adminiſtring the Inward and Spiritual Baptiſm, is by Pouring out and Sprinkling the Graces of the Spirit upon the Souls of the Elect in the Work of Regeneration, why *John* (the forerunner of Chriſt) ſhould Adminiſter his Baptiſm (which was but an External Sign of Chriſt's) by Dipping or Plunging the whole Body into the Water, can never be demonſtrated by all the Wit and conceited Skill in our Doctor, though he were as well Verſt in all the Roots and Heemantique Nouns of the *Hebrew* Tongue, as his ſo much admired *Robertſon* was: And if the Doctor will not be offended, I am very deſirous to know if his ſo highly commended and admired *Robertſon* was (by his ſo great Excellency in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Tongues) more Infallibly acquainted with the Mind of the Holy Ghoſt than other Men; and that Mr. *Robertſon* did certainly believe, that the

Etymo-

Etymology, which he gave of the word *Baptizo*, was Infalible as he ſaid. How came it to paſs, that the Learned *Robertſon* did not Renounce that Baptiſm, which he received in Infancy and by Sprinkling?

I think I knew Maſter *William Robertſon* as well as Dr. *Ruſſel*; and during the time of my Acquaintance with him, I am ſure, he was far enough from Anabaptiſm. All the Skill he had in the Tongues, with his Acquaintance in the Arts, did not convince him, that the Baptiſm he received in Infancy, and by Sprinkling, was a Nullity, as the Doctor holds it is.

But to return to *John the Dooper*, I think fit to aſſure the Doctor, that I own my ſelf bound to believe *John* himſelf, rather than Doctor *Ruſſel*, or any of thoſe Learned Men he ſo greatly Brags of. The words of *John* are ſo plain, that I can ſee no need of a Commentator, to explain their Senſe; he tells us in *Mar.* 1. 8. and in *Mat.* 3. 11. that he did Baptize with Water; but that Chriſt ſhould Baptize with the Holy Ghoſt: ἐν ὕδατι and ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, do both intend and ſignify the very ſame way and manner of Adminiſtration: All the difference between *John* and Chriſt, in both their Baptiſms, is in the Subject Matter, (*viz.*) In the outward Water and the inward Grace: *John* he did Adminiſter

Water,

Water, the outward Sign; but Christ he did Administer the Spiritual Grace: But as touching the manner, it was (most certainly) the very same in both.

Now, if the Doctor grant, (as he must if he speak Truth) that Christ doth Administer the Inward and Spiritual Baptism, by Pouring out or Sprinkling the Graces of the Holy Ghost, he will find it (altogether) Incongruous, and no way agreeing with the *Analogie* of Faith, to hold or assert, that *John* did Administer the outward Sign in such a manner as was directly contrary to Christ. There must be (necessarily) an Harmonious Agreement between the Sign and the Thing signified thereby, which can never be, in case Christ Baptizes by or with, Pouring out or Sprinkling; and *John* should Baptize by Dipping or Plunging into.

As Christ applies the Graces of the Spirit to the Soul in Conversion, not the Soul to the Spirit; so in the outward Baptism *John* he apply'd the Water (the outward Sign) to the Person, not the Person to the Water.

For making the Thing or Point (now in Debate) obvious and plain to the meanest Capacity, let it be seriously considered, how plain and express the Scriptures are in affirming, that Christ's way or manner in

Admi-

Administring the Spiritual Baptism, is by Pouring out and Sprinkling the Holy Spirit on the Souls, which he Regenerates, but never by applying the Souls to the Holy Spirit, Read (without prejudice) *Tit.* 3. 5, 6. *Not by works of righteousness, which we have done, but according to his mercy, he hath saved us by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour.*

ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, hath powered on us, the very same word is made use of in *Acts* 2. 17. *And it shall come to pass in the last days,* (saith God) *I will power out my Spirit on all flesh,* ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα· Both which places are the fulfilling of those Gracious Promises in *Esa.* 44. 3. and *Joel* 2. 28. where the Lord promised, that he will pour Water on him that is thirsty, *&c.* and his Spirit on the Churches Seed. The *Hebrew* word in *Esa.* is אצק רוחי, *Etzek Ruchi*; and in *Joel* the word used to express the same thing by, is, רוחי אשפוך את, *Eshpoch Eth Ruchi:* in neither of which places will our Doctor's ארחם ושבלו *Vetabe lu Otham: And Dip ye them,* be found. The Doctor, the better to help his limping Proselites over the Stile of Heresy and Error, tells his Reader, that the Evangelist *Matthew* wrote his Gospel

the Hebrew Tongue; for Proof whereof, he ſets down his own Opinion, that ſo it is; and this Opinion of his he confirms (as infallible) by the Teſtimony of *Jerom*, and (he thinks) the Opinion of the moſt Learned Men: But the Dr. was ſo wary in this point, that he reſolved the Reader ſhould not (eaſily) find him out in his quotations, the which the Dr. knew would eaſily be done, had he (fairly) directed his Reader to the Book and Page in *Jerom*; where his judgment concerning this matter is expreſt, and by Naming the Learned Men, who were one with him and *Jerom* in this Opinion: His neglect herein forces me to charge him with unfairneſs, (to ſay no worſe) if that be a true rule in Logick, *Dolus latet in Univerſalibus*, that Deceit lyes hid in Univerſals; I am ſure the Dr. (as well as the reſt of his Fraternity, (who frequently walk in this Path) muſt fall under this Laſh; the Drs. lothneſs to Name the Learned Men, who were of his Opinion in this, cauſes me to ſuſpect that he means ſuch as his Learned Baptiſt *Servetus*, and his famous *Caſtellio*, with thoſe other *Arminian* and *Popiſh* Authors, whoſe Names are in his Book.

It were worth while for the Reader to obſerve what ſhifts the poor Man is put to, to prove and make good (from Gods word) his

his new, (though falſly pretended ancient) Mode of Baptizing, by Dipping and Plunging the whole Body into the Water.

He tells his Reader that *Matthew* wrote his Goſpel in Hebrew; the Drs. deſign being (no doubt) to make way for his Hebrew words, ושבלר אתם *and Dip ye them.* The root (ſaith he) is *Tabal*, which is the third Perſon Singular of the *Preter-perfect Tenſe*, and ſignifies he Dipped: He Inſtances in *Naaman* the *Syrian*, 2. *Kings* 5. 14. *Then went he down and Dipped himſelf ſeven times in* Jordan, *&c.* From *Naaman* the *Syrian* the Dr. comes (*per Saltum*) by a long leap to *John* Baptizing in *Jordan*; in *Mat.* 3. 6. you have (ſaith he) the ſame Words again in the Paſſive Voice, which muſt be rendred in *Engliſh*, *And were Dipped of him in* Jordan: And in Ver. 16. you have the ſame root again as it is applied to our Saviour, *And Jeſus when he was Dipped went up ſtraightway out of the Water.*

The Dr. takes for granted, that becauſe *Tabal* ſignifies he Dipped, and that becauſe *Naaman* (in the place above quoted Dipped himſelf in *Jordan*; that therefore in *Matthew* it muſt needs be *Vetabelu Otham*, *and Dip ye them*; and that *John* did Dip all he Baptized, over Head and Ears in *Jordan.*

Am I bound to believe that *Matthew* did write his Goſpel in Hebrew, becauſe the Dr. is of the Opinion he did?

Or, muſt I therefore grant it becauſe *Jerom* is of his Opinion? though neither *Jerom* nor he gives any ſolid reaſons for that their Opinion.

Two things convince me that both *Jerom*, the Dr. and his pretended Learned Men, were all miſtaken in this their Opinion.

Firſt, I find (by Reading) that the Goſpel which *Matthew* is ſuppoſed to have written in Hebrew, was never yet ſeen by any Author, and therefore I muſt mind him of the Maxim, as true and applicable in the preſent caſe, *De non apparentibus, et non exiſtentibus eadem eſt Ratio*, of things not appearing, and of things not exiſting, there is the ſame Reaſon to be given.

Secondly, if *Matthew* had written his Goſpel in Hebrew, he would not have tranſlated into Greek the word *Emmanuel*, in *Mat.* 1. 23. and thoſe whole Sentences, *Eli, Eli, Lamma Sabacthani*, in *Mat.* 27. 46.

But ſuppoſe I ſhould (for Argument ſake) grant (which I utterly deny, and challenge the Dr. to make good) that *Matthew* had Written his Goſpel in the Hebrew Tongue, doth it therefore follow (neceſſarily) that the Holy Ghoſt, (who is ſo exact and preciſe

cise in chooſing the moſt apt and fit words, whereby to expreſs his Mind) ſhould uſe the Hebrew word טבל *Tabal*, which ſignifies to Dip, and not the word רחץ *Rachatz*, which ſignifies to Waſh, or כבס *Kibbem*, which ſignifies the ſame. I have already demonſtrated from the word of God, that in all the places of the *New-Teſtament* where the Holy Ghoſt makes mention of Baptiſm, he doth it by the Derivative Βαπτίζω, which ſignifies to Waſh, by pouring out or ſprinkling Water upon, but never by the Primitive Βάπτω, *Bapto*, which ſignifies to Dip or Plunge into: And when the Holy Ghoſt expreſſeth the Act of Dipping or Plunging into, he doth it by the Primitive Βάπτω, which ſignifies to Dip into, but never by the Derivative Βαπτίζω, which ſignifies to waſh with; by which it plainly appears (to me at leaſt) that rather than the Dr. will looſe his Credit and ſuffer his rotten Cauſe to be loſt, he will rather open door to the old *Babel* confuſion of Tongues, reſolving (Jeſuit like) to ſet the Pen-men of Holy Scripture together by the Ears, and impoſe on his credulous Reader a real Belief, that what the Holy Ghoſt hath laid down (and plainly expreſt) in Greek, he hath gainſaid and contradicted in Hebrew; which Contradiction can never befall the Pen-men of the Holy Scripture, nor (with-

(not Blasphemy) be charged on that Holy Spirit, by which they were Acted and infallibly Inspired.

The reason which *Jerom* gives why *Matthew* writ his Gospel in Hebrew, (*viz.*) for the sake of those Jews which Believed, is no reason at all; for had it been the Will of God it should be so, I know no reason why *Peter*, *James* and *Paul*, (who all three wrote to the Jews, which Believed) should write in Greek, not in Hebrew; witness the two Epistles of *Peter*, the Epistle of *James*, and that of *Paul* to the Hebrews.

The Dr. pleaseth himself in telling his Reader, that in Mr. *William Robertson*'s Hebrew *New-Testament*, he finds these words between the 18th and 19th Verses (of *Mat.* 28 he means) *And as my Father hath sent me, even so also I send you. Go ye therefore*, &c.

These words he sets down in the Hebrew Character, telling his Reader that he finds them not in any Greek Copy.

An Argument (thinks he) that *Matthew* wrote his Gospel in Hebrew! a meer *Non-sequitur*: What though those words be not in *Matthew*, I hope he will not deny that they are in *Jo.* 20. 21. there the Spirit of God hath recorded them; and why the Dr. should look to find them in *Matthew* I know no reason, or wherefore his Learned

Friend

Friend Mr. *Robertson* should take on him to place the Words recorded by *John*, between the 18th and 19th of *Mat.* 28. I cannot conceive: But whatever moved *Robertson* to so presumptuous an Act, in taking on him to alter things of this Nature, (as if by his Skill (in the Hebrew Tongue) he thought himself able to rectifie the Order, in which the Holy Ghost hath set down his own Mind in Writing) I doubt not but the Dr. was well pleased with so Palpable an Aberration; and all for the love and liking he hath to his טבל *Tabal*, he Dipped, and ולמדו *Velammdidu*, Disciple ye. By what I have said, it is easie to judge, that could the Dr. but have his will in two things. First, that the word βαπτίζω, *Baptizo*, doth alway signifie the very same thing with its Primitive βάπτω.

And Secondly, that *Matthew* did write his Gospel in the Hebrew Tongue, and that the words וטבלו אותם *Vetabelu otham*, and Dip ye them, were the very words of *Matthew*. All the Art in Men and Angels could never hinder but that Dipping the whole Body under the Water, must needs be the only right way of administring the outward Baptism.

But both these (on which he erects his tottering structure of Anabaptism) I utterly deny, and do fairly offer, and sincerely

Gerely promiſe him, that if he can confute (by Gods Word) the Arguments laid down, to prove him miſtaken in both, I will forthwith) renounce my Baptiſm received in Infancy and by Sprinkling, as a meer Nullity; and not only ſo, but I will in Pulpit and Print too, Declare (to the World) that I am fully convinced that Dipping the whole Body (under Water) is the only right way of adminiſtring Water-Baptiſm under the *New-Teſtament* Diſpenſation.

And this, (I hope with the offer made him, in clearing up the *Etymology* of the word *Baptizo*) will prove as generous an offer as he made to Maſter *James*.

As touching what is (uſually) Objected from *Mat.* 3. 16. concerning Chriſt's coming up out of the Water. And from *Acts* 8. 38, 39. concerning *Philip* and the Eunuch going down into, and coming up again out of the Water; I need ſay but two things.

Firſt, For any to affirm (poſſitively) what the Word of God affirms not, is (to me) a ſure Argument of an Ignorant, Raſh and Preſumptuous Spirit. Reader, mark the words: *And Jeſus, when he was Baptized, went up ſtraightway out of* (Greek ἀπὸ, not ἐκ, from not out of) *the water*. The Text doth not ſay, (in downright Terms) that Chriſt was Dipt under the Water;

...er; neither doth it appear from *Acts* ...38, 39. that the Eunuch was Dipt, on- ... the Doctor (and his Adherents) will ...ve it to be ſo, right or wrong.

Secondly, There is nothing more certain than that a Perſon may be ſaid (properly enough) to go down into the Water, though he go not in above Shooe (or Ancle) deep, which (I doubt not) was practiſed by both *John* and by *Philip*, in the places above-mentioned; and that for the better conveniency of catching hold of the Water with their Hands, in order to Sprinkle or Pour out the ſame on thoſe they Baptized.

And that which may convince any Man, (not prepoſſeſt with Prejudice againſt the Truth I here contend for) that this was the Practiſe of *John*, and all the firſt Baptizers, (ſo much brag'd of by the Dr.) is the Impoſſibility of the Spirit's being the Author of any (though the leaſt) Contradiction in any part of God's Worſhip.

Hence I argue. That which can no way be prov'd or made good by expreſs Teſtimony of God's Word, or deduced therefrom by ſound (and neceſſary) Conſequence, is an Invention in God's Worſhip, which God will Reject and Abominate as not appointed by him.

But Dipping the whole Body under Wa-

ter

ter in Baptiſm, can no way be prov[illegible] made good by expreſs Teſtimony of Gods Word, nor yet by ſound (or neceſſar- Conſequence deduced therefrom.

Therefore Dipping the whole Body under Water (in Baptiſm) is an Invention in God's Worſhip, which God will Reject and Abominate, becauſe not appointed by him.

The major Propoſition will not be denied. That which ſecures the Minor, and proves the Concluſion to be the Truth, (which all the Wit of the Adverſary will never be able to prevail againſt) is the Scriptures ſilence, in that it no where gives an expreſs Witneſs (or Teſtimony) hereto And the Impoſſibility of that being prov' a ſound Conſequence (from God's Word,) which makes God the Author of Self-Contradiction.

The Word of God no where commands Dipping in Baptiſm, neither doth it ſay (in expreſs terms,) that either *John* or any of the Apoſtles did Baptize by Dipping under the Water. Reader! Keep the Adverſary cloſe to this, where doth the word *Dip* appear, either in the command of Chriſt, (when ſpeaking of Baptizing) or in any Inſtance of Perſons Baptized by *Joh.* or the Apoſtles? If thou keep cloſe to this, the Enemy will retreat and fly to Conſe-

quence

[illegible] which, if he doth, (as no doubt he will) [illegible] pursue him with a Holy Courage, be not a- [illegible] his daring Brags. How do you prove, that [illegible] sound and Scriptural Consequence, which [illegible] the Holy Spirit of God the Author of Self- [illegible]adiction?

[illegible]hat thus it is, will (evidently) appear, the Ad- [illegible]sary can no way avoid it. If thou urge, (with an [illegible]oly Zeal for Truth) what is (Graphically) set down [illegible] God's own Word, concerning the manner of Application of the Blood of the Sacrifices, and the Waters of Purifications, both which had a Typical Relation to the Spiritual Baptism, Administred by the Spirit of Christ. These were applied under the Ceremonial Administration, by Sprinkling, not by Dipping, (as hath been before observed.) The Prophets, who foretold of Christ, and the great Benefits which should come by him to Believers under the Gospel. They set it forth by Sprinkling, witness *Esa.* 52. 15. and *Ezek.* 36. 25. and in the Gospel [illegible]e are assured, that the Spirit of Christ doth apply the inward Spiritual Baptism, by Sprinkling or Pouring out the Graces of his Spirit on the Soul in the Work of Regeneration, see *Tit.* 3. 6.

Now to affirm, that Christ either commands Dipping, or that he (himself) was Dipp'd in Baptism, what is it, but to affirm, that Christ's Spirit doth contradict himself? What is pretended (for Dipping) from *John* 3. 23. hath nothing in it to help their Cause, but what empty Conceit and Unscriptural Confidence supply. *John* (saith the Adversary) *was Baptizing in* Ænon, *because there was much Water there: Therefore he Baptized by Dipping the whole Body under the Water.*

The stress (or weight) of the Argument is laid on a fond Conceit, that much Water (there) signifies and imports Greatness and Depth of Water, which (plainly) appears to be otherwise, witness the *Greek*, ὕδατα Πολλὰ.

Many Waters denoting
Rivulets or Springs of Water, wherewith
abounded, than that the Waters of that place
deep. And it was (I doubt not) for Convenienc
that John left Bethabarah, (a place of deeper W
becauſe Ænon was (every way) more convenien
commodious for the multitudes o People, which c
daily to his Baptiſm.

Piſcator's Note upon the place, may not (here)
either improper or impertinent to the Purpoſe
hand, *Videntur ſignificari plures Rivi, non au*
Magnum Flumen. Many Rivulets, not one g
or Water, ſeems (here) to be ſignified, ſaith that learn
ed Author; with whom agrees the beſt Geographe
who give the Deſcription of that place.

I conclude my Treatiſe (againſt Dipping in Bap
tiſm) with that Saying of Godly and Judicious) *S*
denham: If (ſaith he) *there be any abſolute need of Di*
ping, it is to cool the heat of thoſe Mens Spirits, who de
Baptiſm to be true (or right) Baptiſm, becauſe not A
miniſtred by Plunging or Dipping.

Reader! Obſerve, that as in the Sacrament of th
Lord's Supper, it is not ſo much the Quantity of th
Wine drunk in that Ordinance, (by a Believer)
the Quality, which ſignifies and repreſents the Bloo
of Chriſt.

Chriſt doth not tye a Believer up to ſuch or ſuc
a quantity of Wi to be drunk in remembrance o
his Blood-ſhed, but (only) commands Wine to
drunk, leaving to the Diſcretion of the Believ
what quantity to drink.

So in Water-Baptiſm it is not the depth or qu
tity of Water which is neceſſary to right Baptiſm,
real Water; it matters not how ſmall the quant
be, ſo there be but a Sprinkling (or Pouring out)
Water on the Subject, to repreſent the Sprinkli
(or Pouring out) of the Graces of God's Spirit on t
Elect Soul in Effectual Calling.

F I N I S.

UMI